THE

# HOLY BIBLE

ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORIZED VERSION A.D. (1611),

WITH AN EXPLANATORY AND CRITICAL

## Commentary

AND

## A Revision of the Translation,

BY BISHOPS AND OTHER CLERGY

OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

EDITED

BY F. C. COOK, M.A., CANON OF EXETER,

PREACHER AT LINCOLN'S INN, CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO THE QUEEN.

NEW TESTAMENT.

VOL. I

*ST. MATTHEW—ST. MARK—ST. LUKE.*

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1878.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS,
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

# NOTICE.

The list of contributors to the Speaker's Commentary on the New Testament, selected by the Committee at the commencement of the work, has necessarily undergone a few changes, owing to the death or altered position of some among them.

In this first volume the introduction to the three Synoptical Gospels has been written, as was originally contemplated, by the Archbishop of York. Dean Mansel, who had undertaken the commentary on the first two Gospels, died in July, 1871, but left complete notes on twenty-six chapters of St. Matthew. Those notes are printed without any alteration or addition, except a few references to works which have since been published, and the headings to the sections, which, in accordance with the general plan of the Commentary, have been inserted by the Editor.

The Editor is solely responsible for the notes on the last two chapters of St. Matthew, and on the whole of St. Mark's Gospel. The Bishop of St. David's prepared his commentary on St. Luke some years ago, but owing to the pressure of episcopal duties was unable to prepare it for the press. The Editor has had to complete and revise this portion of the work, for which in its present state he is ultimately responsible. In the following volumes the only changes which have hitherto been made are the substitution of Professor Westcott for the late Dean Alford, as commentator on St. John's Gospel; of the Bishop of Derry for the late Dean Jeremie, and the present Bishop of Truro, who had undertaken the commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and Philemon; and of Professor Lightfoot and the Rev. J. Rawson Lumby for the Editor, to whom the commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude was originally assigned.

# CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

## THE GOSPELS.

### GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

BY WILLIAM THOMSON, D.D., ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| *Authenticity of the Four Gospels* | xiii |
| " *St. Matthew* | xxv |
| " *St. Mark* | xxxvii |
| " *St. Luke* | xlvi |
| *Works referred to, in the preparation of this Introduction* | lxxii |
| *Table of the Harmony of the Four Gospels* | lxxv |


## ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

COMMENTARY AND CRITICAL NOTES, Chap. i.–xxvi.

BY H. L. MANSEL, D.D., DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S. pp. 1–169.


| | |
|---|---|
| *On the Chronological Order of* Chap. ix. | 48 |
| *On the Brethren of the Lord.* Chap. xiii. | 72 |
| *On the latter part of our Lord's Ministry, from His Departure from Galilee to His final entry into Judea.* Chap. xviii. | 98 |
| *On the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard.* Chap. xx. | 110 |
| *On Proselytes.* Chap. xxiii. 15 | 133 |
| *On the Day of our Lord's Last Supper.* Chap. xxvi. | 164 |


COMMENTARY AND CRITICAL NOTES, Chap. xxvii., xxviii.

BY F. C. COOK, M.A., CANON OF EXETER. pp. 170–197.


Additional Notes on Chap. xxvii. 2, 9, 33, 34 . . . . . 188

# ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

COMMENTARY AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY CANON COOK.
pp. 199–308.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Additional Notes: | |
| On Chap. i. 1, 2, 4, 14, 27, 29 | 209 |
| On Chap. ii. 1, 14, 23 | 215 |
| On Chap. iii. 5 | 223 |
| Note on Chap. vi. 20 | 242 |
| Note on Chap. ix. 44, 49 | 261 |
| *On the Authenticity of the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel* | 301 |


# ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL.

COMMENTARY AND CRITICAL NOTES. BY W. B. JONES, D.D., BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S, AND BY THE EDITOR. pp. 309–472.

ADDITIONAL NOTES BY THE EDITOR.


| | |
|---|---|
| Additional Notes: | |
| On Chap. i. 1 | 319 |
| On Chap. ii. 2. *On the Census of Cyrenius* | 326 |
| On Chap. ii. 14 | 328 |
| On Chap. iv. 1, 16, 44 | 340 |
| Additional Note on Chap. vi. 35, 37 | 353 |
| *Note on the Section from* ix. 51 *to* xviii. 14 | 379 |
| Additional Notes: | |
| On Chap. xi. 2, 3, 4 | 397 |
| On Chap. xiii. 34 | 413 |

# THE GOSPELS.

## INTRODUCTION.


| § | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | *The Four Gospels* | vii |
| 2 | *Amount of Agreement* | viii |
| 3 | *Agreement and Difference* | ix |
| 4 | *Attempts at Explanation* | x |
| 5 | *Theory of an Original Document* | x |
| 6 | *Objections* | xii |
| 7 | *State of Literature in Palestine* | xii |
| 8 | *Oral teaching as the source of the Gospels* | xiii |
| 9 | *Use of preceding Gospels by the Evangelists* | xiv |
| 10 | *Position of St. Mark* | xiv |
| 11 | *The Logia of Papias* | xv |
| 12 | *Dependence of St. Mark* | xvi |
| 13 | *Theory of frequent Recensions* | xvi |
| 14 | *Subject matter of the inquiry* | xvii |
| 15 | *Exaggerated theories* | xix |
| | **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW.** | |
| 16 | *The Man* | xix |
| 17 | *Language of the Gospel* | xx |
| 18 | *Objections to Hebrew Original* | xxi |
| 19 | *General Conclusions* | xxii |
| 20 | *Language of Palestine* | xxii |
| 21 | *Date of the Gospel, before the Destruction of Jerusalem* | xxii |
| 22 | *Not long before* | xxiv |
| 23 | *Is this the date of the Gospel as we have it?* | xxv |
| 24 | *The Postulate of Time* | xxv |
| 25 | *Character of the Work* | xxvi |
| 26 | *Its Contents and Structure* | xxvi |
| 27 | *Objection Answered* | xxvii |
| 28 | *Internal Consistency* | xxvii |
| 29 | *Old Testament Quotations* | xxviii |
| 30 | *Authorship* | xxix |
| 31 | *Objections* | xxx |
| 32 | *Summary* | xxxi |
| | **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.** | |
| 33 | *John Mark* | xxxi |
| 34 | *St. Mark and St. Peter* | xxxiii |
| 35 | *The Gospel* | xxxiii |
| 36 | *Contents of the Gospel* | xxxiv |
| 37 | *Peculiar Features of the Gospel* | xxxv |
| 38 | *Relation of this Gospel to St. Peter* | xxxvi |
| 39 | *Various Opinions on the Position of St. Mark's Gospel with reference to the others* | xxxvi |
| 40 | *St. Matthew and St. Mark* | xxxvii |
| | **THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE.** | |
| 41 | *The Man* | xl |
| 42 | *Journey of St. Luke with St. Paul* | xli |
| 43 | *The Introduction to the Gospel* | xlii |
| 44 | *Date of Gospel* | xliii |
| 45 | *The Place* | xliii |
| 46 | *Schleiermacher's View* | xliv |
| 47 | *Marcion* | xliv |
| 48 | *Marcion's Gospel* | xlv |
| 49 | *St. Luke and St. Paul* | xlvi |
| 50 | *Comparison of Diction* | xlvii |
| 51 | *Contents of St. Luke's Gospel* | xlviii |
| 52 | *Summary* | xlix |
| 53 | *Divine Authority* | liii |
| 54 | *Evidence from the Existence of the Church* | lviii |
| 55 | *The Supernatural in the Gospels* | lix |
| 56 | *Evidence for the Gospel Collections* | lx |
| 57 | *Summary* | lxiv |
| 58 | *Use of the Gospels in Public Worship* | lxv |
| 59 | *Conclusion* | lxv |


§ 1. *The Four Gospels.*—The Gospel of Jesus Christ is contained in four Books, each giving His Gospel "according to" a particular writer. The Books have come to be called in common speech the four Gospels. These works are very short: in a small Greek Testament the Gospel according to St. Matthew occupies 69 pages; that according to St. Mark, 42; that of St. Luke, 74; and that of St. John, 54. It is evident that a complete biography could not be

included in such narrow limits: and the most careless inspection would shew that no attempt at a complete biography, in the modern sense of the word, has been made in any of the cases. Of the first thirty years of the Lord's life on earth, and of His training for His brief ministry in that time, there is hardly any record. Just one fact, recorded only by one Evangelist (St. Luke), offers a glimpse of a childhood sanctified by pious thoughts and by a divine purpose. It is evident that the three who omitted all such records, and the one who confined himself to this short story, did not consider that a continuous record of growth and training, of youthful aspirations and of self-consecration to a future work, belonged to their purpose. With the baptism of Jesus commences the more complete narrative of His life. But even here there are facts to explain which have occupied the critical faculty of theologians from the first, and which for more than a century have been the ground of ardent controversy, not yet brought to an end. The Gospel according to St. John, touching the others at its beginning and at its close, and at a very few points in its middle course, pursues for the most part an independent path, as though the object of the writer had been to supply such facts and discourses as the others had omitted. In the first three Gospels the ministry of the Lord in Galilee is made prominent; St. John gives a large place to His ministry in Judæa, passed over by St. Matthew almost in silence. Large discourses, and these of fundamental importance to the new "kingdom of heaven" that was come into the world, find due place in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and are not even mentioned by St. John: whilst his last finds place for words of greatest moment, not recorded elsewhere, and notably for the last discourse of Jesus ending with the 17th chapter of St. John. In a "Harmony of the Gospels," such as those which have been framed from the earliest times, the fourth Gospel, as to the chief parts of it, refuses to be included: it cannot be compared with the rest, for it occupies different ground. There is of course an explanation of this remarkable fact, which will be shewn in its proper place. But in the meantime let it be remembered that the Gospels present a history of the salvation of mankind by Jesus Christ the Son of God, and not a minute and exact life of the Saviour. St. Luke, at the outset of his Gospel, proposes to give an accurate and orderly account of all that had taken place; but he limits it to the things that were surely believed amongst the disciples, that Theophilus might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been instructed. Not a complete life; but the life as it bore on the belief and convictions of the people of God.

§ 2. *Amount of Agreement.*—In the first three Gospels there is a large amount of agreement as to the facts related and the language in which they are expressed. If the history be harmonised,[1] and then divided into 89 sections (this number is arbitrary),[2] it will be found that in 42 of these all the narratives coincide, that 12 more are given by Matthew and Mark only, that 5 are common to Mark and Luke only, and that 14 are found in Matthew and Luke. To these should be added 5 peculiar to St. Matthew, 2 to St. Mark, and 9 to St. Luke, and the number is complete. This estimate, however, applies only to general coincidence as to the facts of the narrative; the amount of precise verbal coincidence is much smaller. "We may make the valuation in a more exact manner," says Reuss,[3] "by saying that the text of Matthew contains 330 verses which are not found elsewhere, that of Mark, 68; and that of Luke, 541. The two first have from 170 to 180 verses which are wanting in St. Luke; the first and the third have about 230 or 240 which are wanting in St. Mark; the two last have about 50 that are wanting in St. Matthew. The total number of verses common to all three is only from 330 to 370. These figures are partly approximative, because the verses in the second Gospel are generally shorter, which prevents an exact mathematical calculation."

[1] The article GOSPELS in Dr. Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' from the same pen as this Introduction, will be occasionally used here.
[2] Reuss ('Histoire évangélique,' 1876) divides into 124 sections.
[3] Ibid.

§ 3. *Agreement and Difference.*—As regards the verbal agreement of the three writers, it may be said that in no other case would it be possible to find three writers so independent as to their matter, who shewed such minute and abundant coincidences of expression; and that no other three writers have shewn such a careful adherence to the very same forms of expression, who have also shewn so great an independence in the selection and omission of subjects. It is the combination of these two elements which has made the subject of Gospel Harmony one of the most difficult problems of criticism. "By far the larger portion," says Professor Andrews Norton ('Genuineness,' i. p. 240, 2nd ed.), "of this verbal agreement is found in the recital of the words of others, and particularly of the words of Jesus. Thus, in Matthew's Gospel, the passages verbally coincident with one or both of the other two Gospels amount to less than a sixth part of its contents; and of this about seven-eighths occur in the recital of the words of others, and only about one-eighth in what, by way of distinction, I may call mere narrative, in which the Evangelist, speaking in his own person, was unrestrained in the choice of his expressions. In Mark, the proportion of coincident passages to the whole contents of the Gospel is about one-sixth, of which not one-fifth occurs in the narrative. Luke has still less agreement of expression with the other Evangelists. The passages in which it is found amount only to about a tenth part of his Gospel; and but an inconsiderable portion of it appears in the narrative—less than a twentieth part. The proportions should be further compared with those which the narrative part of each Gospel bears to that in which the words of others are professedly repeated. Matthew's narrative occupies about one-fourth of his Gospel, Mark's about one-half, and Luke's about one-third. It may easily be computed, therefore, that the proportion of verbal coincidence found in the narrative part of each Gospel, compared with what exists in the other part, is about in the following ratios: in Matthew as one to somewhat more than two, in Mark as one to four, and in Luke as one to ten." Examples of agreement are too numerous to offer much difficulty in selection. But the question can only be minutely examined by means of the original text; and so it lies beyond the scope of the present work. The reader may, however, compare the following large sections of the three Gospels:

| Matt. iv. 12 to Matt. xviii. 35. | Mark i. 1 to Mark xiii. | Luke iii. 1 to Luke iv. 13. |
|---|---|---|

The order and arrangement are in remarkable harmony, although the sections consist for the most part of detached narratives, each in itself complete, and often isolated from the others by special words of introduction and conclusion. The Lord healed a great multitude of sick; but the three always select the same cases for fuller record. The utterances of Jesus in like manner must have been very numerous; but the Evangelists agree in reporting a certain selection. St. Matthew and St. Luke cite the Lord's denunciation against Chorazin and Bethsaida; but agree also in omitting the fault which had brought down the sentence. When the Lord's teaching is associated with some circumstance of time and place, all the Evangelists concur in surrounding it with the proper accessories. Of verbal agreement the feeding of the 5000 (Matt. xiv. 19, 20; Mark vi. 41, 42; Luke ix. 16, 17), and the healing of the paralytic (Matt. ix. 1–8; Mark ii. 1–12; Luke v. 17–26), are examples. In translating the words of Jesus, who used, no doubt, the Aramaic language, the inspired writers coincide in points that have nothing to do with fidelity of rendering; thus, the Greek word for "hardly," which occurs nowhere in the New Testament except in this place and the two parallel places in Matt. xix. 23, the irregular form of the word for "are forgiven," in Matt. ix. 2, 5; the diminutive form for "ear" (Matt. xxvi. 51); a peculiar double augment in "was restored" (Matt. xii. 13), all are repeated exactly by the other Evangelists, whereas three writers, translating in entire independence of each other, and of common

sources, would certainly have failed to light upon coincidences so many and so unlikely. There would of course be no wonder if the verbal correspondence were maintained throughout. The intention would then be manifest, to give narratives identical in all points. But the marks of independence are as manifest as the points of agreement. Thus, on comparing Matt. xi. 25–27 with Luke x. 21, 22, there appears an amount of agreement in reporting our Lord's words, minute, exact, such as no two writers rendering into Greek the same short discourses would have exhibited; but, whilst the coincidence reaches down to the smallest words, there is an important variation. Instead of "knoweth the Son," Luke has "knoweth *who the Son is.*" The departure from St. Matthew's report is but as to three words: the agreement applies to more than fifty; yet the former is sufficient to stamp each of the passages with the character of an independent report, and to put aside all question of mere copying. Such cases could be multiplied indefinitely.[1] The general results of such an examination may be summed up as follows.

The verbal and material agreement of the three first Evangelists is such as does not occur in any other authors who have written independently of each other. The verbal agreement is greater where the spoken words of others are cited than where facts are recorded; and greatest in quotations of the words of our Lord: and as these quotations are all translations from the Aramaic dialect, there is something more at work than the scrupulous exactness of a faithful reporter. But, in some leading events, as in the calling of the four first disciples, in the calling of Matthew, and in the account of the Transfiguration, the agreement even in expression is remarkable. The narratives of our Lord's early life, in St. Matthew and St. Luke, have little in common; while St. Mark does not include that part of the history in his plan. The agreement in the narrative portions of the Gospels begins with the baptism of John, and reaches its highest point in the account of the Passion of our Lord, and the facts that closely preceded it; so that a direct ratio might almost be said to exist between the amount of agreement and the nearness of the facts related to the Passion. After this event, in the account of His burial and resurrection, the coincidences are few. The language of all three is Greek with Hebrew idioms: these Hebraisms are most abundant in St. Mark, and fewest in St. Luke.

§ 4. *Attempts at Explanation.*—These facts exhibit the first three Gospels as three distinct accounts of the life and teaching of the Redeemer, but with a greater amount of agreement than three wholly independent and isolated accounts would be expected to manifest. The agreement would be no difficulty without the differences; it would only shew that all had agreed to give forth the Gospel in the same form of words, attributing these to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The difference of form and style without the agreement would present no difficulty, since there may be a substantial harmony between accounts that differ greatly in modes of expression; and the very difference might be a guarantee of independence. The harmony and the variety together form the problem, which has occupied Biblical critics for above a century. It may be possible now, after every line of research seems to have been eagerly followed and perhaps almost exhausted, to put some limits to these enquiries, and to sift the certain from that which must remain uncertain to the end. Those who desire to see vindicated the truth and historical character of the Gospels will not have cause, upon the whole, to regret that the controversy has taken place.

§ 5. *Theory of an Original Document.*—One hypothesis to account for this state of facts is that of a common original document, now lost to us, from which all the Evangelists drew, treating it, however, as the materials for their narrations rather than as a document whose every detail they were bound to preserve.

[1] The subject may be pursued by the help of Anger's 'Synopsis,' or by the Harmonies of Tischendorf or Greswell. The little work of Clausen makes the process of examination easy, by drawing attention to every variation of expression. See also Holtzmann, 'Die Synoptischen Evangelien,' ch. i.

A passage from Epiphanius seems at first to give some colour to this (*Hæres.* 51, 6), but in the expression which he employs, "from the same fountain," he refers to the inspiring Spirit from which the three drew their authority, and not to any earthly version, oral or written, of His divine message. The theory of Eichhorn, now pretty well exploded, was framed upon such a view. It appeared to him that the features common to all three Gospels were contained in a certain Gospel, which had been used in them all. Such a Gospel would naturally be written at first in the dialect of Palestine, the Syro-Chaldaic. He tries to shew, from an exact comparison of passages, that "the sections, whether great or small, which are common to St. Matthew and St. Mark but not to St. Luke, and which at the same time occupy places in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark which correspond to each other, were additions made in the copies used by St. Matthew and St. Mark, but not in the copy used by St. Luke; and, in like manner, that the sections found in the corresponding places of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, but which were not contained in the Gospel of St. Matthew, were additions made in the copies used by St. Mark and St. Luke" (p. 192). Thus Eichhorn considers himself entitled to assume that he can reconstruct the original document, and also that there must have been four other documents to account for the phenomena of the text. He makes—

1. The original document.

2. An altered copy which St. Matthew used.

3. An altered copy which St. Luke used.

4. A third copy, made from the two preceding, used by St. Mark.

5. A fourth altered copy, used by St. Matthew and St. Luke in common.

As there is no *external* evidence worth considering that this original or any of its numerous copies ever existed, the worth of this elaborate hypothesis must depend upon its furnishing the only explanation, and that a sufficient one, of the facts of the text. Bishop Marsh, however, finds it necessary, in order to complete the account of the text, to raise the number of documents to eight, still without producing any external evidence for the existence of any of them; and this, on one side, deprives Eichhorn's theory of the merit of completeness, and, on the other, presents a much broader surface to the obvious objections. Like the earlier astronomers, who, when the theory of cycles proved insufficient to explain the heavenly motions, did not fail to introduce epicycles to sustain the tottering theory, the English theologian enlarges the theory of his German predecessor. He assumes the existence of

1. A Hebrew original.

2. A Greek translation.

3. A transcript of No. 1, with alterations and additions.

4. Another, with another set of alterations and additions.

5. Another, combining both the preceding, used by St. Mark, who also used No. 2.

6. Another, with the alterations and additions of No. 3, and with further additions, used by St. Matthew.

7. Another, with those of No. 4 and further additions, used by St. Luke, who also used No. 2.

8. A wholly distinct Hebrew document, in which our Lord's precepts, parables, and discourses were recorded, but not in chronological order; used both by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

To this it is added, that "as the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke contain Greek translations of Hebrew materials, which were incorporated into St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel, the person who translated St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel into Greek frequently derived assistance from the Gospel of St. Mark, where he had matter in connexion with St. Matthew: and in those places, but in those places only, where St. Mark had no matter in connexion with St. Matthew, he had frequently recourse to St. Luke's Gospel" (p. 361). One is hardly surprised after this to learn that Eichhorn now put forth a revised hypothesis (*Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1804), in which a supposed Greek translation of a supposed Aramaic original took a conspicuous part; nor that Hug was able to point out that even

the most liberal assumption of written documents had not provided for one case, that of the verbal agreement of St. Mark and St. Luke, to the exclusion of St. Matthew; which, though of rare occurrence, would require, on Eichhorn's theory, an additional Greek version.

§ 6. *Objections.*—An additional Greek version could have been supplied on demand, for it is the advantage of this theory, that its facts are all supplied from the mind, and, therefore, practically unlimited. It is as easy to supply eighty documents as eight. To assume for every new set of facts the existence of another complete edition and recension of the whole original work, seems a needless waste of assumptions; it would have been enough to suppose that some fragmentary memorials had existed, such as St. Luke seems to allude to, in the opening of his Gospel, which had been adopted by an Evangelist into his work. This original Gospel is supposed to have been of such authority as to be circulated everywhere; yet so defective, as to require and to receive annotation from almost any hand, and so little reverenced that almost no hand spared it. If all the Evangelists agreed to draw from it, in one or other of its forms, it must have been widely, if not universally, accepted in the Church; and yet there is no record of its existence. Numerous apocryphal Gospels have floated down to us; this, once the one Gospel of the Church, has vanished quite.

The force of this dilemma has been felt: if the work was of high authority, it would have been preserved, or at least mentioned and quoted; if of lower authority, it could not have been the basis of the three canonical Gospels; and various attempts have been made to escape from it. To give but one example, for it is needless to stir to the lowest strata the dead bones of this controversy, Bertholdt ingeniously argues[1] that a Gospel written by St. Paul, and transmitted to the Christians in Pontus, was the basis of numerous Gospels; and assumes that it was also the "original Gospel," so that Marcion's Gospel would be a transcript somewhat corrupted of the primitive document. But there is no proof at all that St. Paul used any written Gospel, and it may now be taken as proved after a very full discussion that the opinion of Tertullian and Epiphanius was the true one, that the so-called Gospel of Marcion was not an independent work; but an abridged version of St. Luke's Gospel, altered by Marcion to suit his own heretical tenets. It would follow then that the assumed original Gospel had perished without a trace, and that the same fate had followed the recensions and translations, be they more or fewer in number.

§ 7. *State of literature in Palestine.*—But it may be asked whether the state of letters in Palestine at this time was such as to make this constant editing, translating, annotating, and enriching of a history a natural and probable process? With the independence of the Jews their literature had declined; from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, if a writer in Palestine arose, his works became known, if at all, in Greek translations, through the Alexandrine Jews. The period of which we are now treating was, for the Jews, one of very little literary activity; and, if this applies to all classes, it would be true of the humble and uneducated class from which the first converts came (Acts iv. 13; James ii. 5). Even the "second law," which grew up after the captivity, and in which the knowledge of the learned class consisted, was handed down by tradition, and not reduced to writing. The theory of Eichhorn presupposes a people of literary habits, and a class amongst that people whose education was high, and who had much literary activity: here, however, the conditions are exactly the reverse.[1] Perhaps Eichhorn hardly realised the fact that, in breaking with the traditionary account of the origin of the Gospels, he was abandoning on the one hand the best mode of proof for the origin of a book, and was opening a door, on the other hand, to a hundred theories, many of them, like that of Strauss, fatal to every feeling of rever-

[1] 'Einleitung,' vol. iii. pp. 1208–1223.

[1] Gieseler, p. 59, *et seq.*

ence for the Books in which the Gospel of Peace is conveyed to us. But still to Eichhorn belongs the merit of having laid bare the whole of the problem now before us, and of having honestly attempted a solution of it, which, however, possesses for us now little more than an antiquarian interest.[1]

§ 8. *Oral teaching as the source of the Gospels.*—There is another supposition, of which Gieseler may be accepted as the best expositor, to account for the relations of the three first Gospels. 'The written Gospels resemble each other so much because the oral teaching of the Apostles had taken a settled form; and there are differences in the midst of the agreement, because the writers were not bound to that oral teaching which yet they desired to preserve, and, for the most part, to follow.' This hypothesis is worthy of consideration, both because it appears to possess at least a ground of truth, and because it seems at first sight difficult to realise. 'From the day of Pentecost, the Apostles began the work of preaching the Gospel, which was in a short time to overspread the world; but it is certain that for many years not one of the four Gospels existed out of which they might preach. So zealous were the Apostles in their work that they divested themselves of the labour of ministering to the poor, in order that they might "give themselves continually unto prayer and to the ministry of the word" (Acts vi.). Prayer and preaching were the business of their lives. Now their preaching must in great part have consisted, from the nature of the case, of a recital of the facts of the life of Jesus Christ. They had been the eyewitnesses of a wonderful life, of acts and sufferings which it concerned the world to know. Many of their hearers had never heard of Jesus; many others had received false accounts of one whom it suited the rulers of the Jews to denounce as an impostor. The ministry of the Lord had taken place chiefly in Galilee, but the first preaching was in Judæa. It would, therefore, be necessary to lay a groundwork of facts, before there could be inferences from, and applications of, those facts. The preaching would be more akin to the daily lessons in a modern service, than to the sermon. 'This view is confirmed by what we know of the Apostles' preaching from the Acts of the Apostles. Peter at Cæsarea, and Paul at Antioch, preach alike the facts of the Redeemer's life and death. Now there would be a tendency to preserve one form and order in this historical preaching. The account of some miracle would be told again and again in one form of words, and the narrative of a journey would follow the same order of events, and the events selected would be always the same. Both teachers and hearers would have an interest in this: the teachers, from the wish that they should be as exact as possible; and the hearers, in order that their want of instruction and cultivation should have as small a burden to bear as possible. To say that such an oral tradition could not grow up amongst ourselves, is hardly to the purpose. We never impose such a task on our memory, because we have at hand the more artificial support of written works for all that we have to learn. Plato does not fear to put before us an account of a long dialogue, not from the memory of the writer, but professing to be an account given to the writer of what some one had heard from some others; and the hearer does not betray any wonder at efforts of memory so strange to us.

There will be much difference of opinion as to the share to be assigned to this body of traditional teaching in the formation of our present Gospels. But there probably will be little difference of opinion as to the likelihood of there having grown up a body and form of preaching, preserved, at first, only in the memory of those who preached and heard, of which the life and words of Jesus formed the subjects, and which tended to be, not merely in substance but in details, one and the same everywhere, with a resemblance closer and more marked in proportion as the words and events were more important.

[1] For a fuller account might be consulted Marsh's Michaelis (see above); Holtzmann, pp. 17, *et seq.*; Hilgenfeld, 'Evangelien,' pp. 2, *et seq.* See also, Smith, 'Dictionary of the Bible,' article GOSPELS.

§ 9. *Use of preceding Gospels by the Evangelists.*—Is any of the canonical Gospels copied from any other? This might seem to be a question easy to answer by internal evidence, but it has not proved so. In order to examine it, let us look at the contents of the three Gospels. Each records the Baptism of Jesus, each the Passion. In each there is one intermediate event, the Transfiguration, carefully narrated, with all that precedes and follows it; and it is clear that about the time of this event, the teaching of the Lord entered upon a new phase; that "from that time forth" He began to unfold the plan of His sufferings and death.[1] We shall not greatly err if we place this event about six months before the Crucifixion. The scale of treatment of the divisions by each Evangelist is this. In St. Matthew the history up to the Transfiguration occupies rather more than one-half of the whole; the history of the last six months, rather less than one-half, and the history of the Passion, beginning from the entering into Jerusalem, about one-third. In St. Mark, the history up to the Transfiguration is almost exactly one-half; and the history of the Passion occupies about a third. In St. Luke, the first part of the history is a little more than one-third; and the account of the Passion about one-fourth of the whole. The main reason of the difference between St. Matthew and St. Mark in point of length, is that the former contains many discourses of the Lord that are wanting in the latter. And the main reason of the difference between St. Mark and St. Luke, is, that St. Luke interposes between the Transfiguration and the Passion, a long section containing acts and sayings of the Lord, which neither of the Evangelists have recorded. These figures may serve to illustrate the remark already made that the Evangelists do not intend to give a biography of the Lord in the common sense of the word: of a life extending to thirty-three years, the last six months occupy a half: and the last week a third or a fourth part.

[1] Matt. xvi. 21.
[2] Compare note at the end of St. Luke, ch. ix.

§ 10. *Position of St. Mark.*—Now the question whether any of the Evangelists copied from the others, will turn mainly upon the position that is assigned to St. Mark. His Gospel is the briefest: it lacks many of the discourses in St. Matthew; and St. Luke has a long section of which St. Mark gives nothing. Of the matter common to all three St. Mark is chiefly composed. Or, to put it in another way, it is possible by eliminating from St. Matthew and St. Luke the features peculiar to each, and those in which they agree, but do not correspond to St. Mark, to produce three narratives, containing in the main the same events, told in the same manner, and often with a minute agreement as to modes of expression, that is quite inconsistent with the theory that three independent persons wrote down at different times and in their own manner three quite separate accounts of what they had seen and heard.[1] The hypothesis that one made use of the other is the most obvious one, at least until its difficulties are explored; and the most obvious form of this would be that St. Mark's narrative, which contains the largest portion of the matter common to all, was also the earliest; and that the others used this as the source of all that portion which they possess in common. As regards St. Matthew and St. Mark, perhaps the most plausible form of the hypothesis would be that which several writers have lately adopted, which is thus described by Reuss:[2] "That the first Gospel is a work proceeding from a second hand, and is substantially founded on two more ancient works: that the facts have been drawn for the most part from the Gospel of St. Mark, of which the order has been preserved, saving some changes caused by the special object of the editor and his pragmatic method. The great agglomerations of sentences—the discourses—as well as some other elements wanting in St. Mark, have been drawn from a collection, of which we know the name of the author, and which may very probably have passed entire into the new edition. This supposition

[1] See Sabatier, 'Sur les Sources,' &c. 1866.
[2] 'Histoire évangélique,' p. 73.

would explain how the name of the author of the collection has remained attached to the complete edition, to our existing Gospel of St. Matthew."

However plausible this theory has appeared to some, it will not bear a closer criticism. It rests upon two suppositions; that St. Matthew has followed the order and succession of historical events as given by St. Mark, and that there is clear evidence that St. Matthew made a collection of our Lord's discourses only, to which the historical narrative of St. Mark would be a desirable, a necessary complement. But neither of these suppositions is well grounded. There are historical facts in Matthew which the Gospel of St. Mark does not contain; as the sending to Jesus by John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 2; Luke vii. 18); and the healing of the centurion's servant (Matt. viii. 5; Luke vii. 1). Again, the omission by Matthew of the striking scene in the synagogue of Capernaum (Mark i. 21) cannot be accounted for on this supposition.[1] Thus there is the double objection that if St. Matthew followed St. Mark he did not take all that he found there,[2] and he also produced more than he found there.

§ 11. *The Logia of Papias.*—What is the proof that Matthew compiled a collection of the Lord's discourses only? None. Papias says, "Matthew wrote the oracles (*logia*) in the Hebrew dialect; and every one interpreted them as he was able."[3] Schleiermacher, explaining *logia* as "discourses," infers that this collection made by St. Matthew consisted wholly or chiefly of discourses, to the exclusion of historical events. This translation of the word is not satisfactory; but if it were, Papias, in the same passage, speaks of St. Mark in connection with "the Lord's discourses" (*logous*), where he explains that this includes "things said *and done*."[4] If in the one case discourses stand for the whole acts, why not in the other? Papias puts Mark and Matthew side by side; if they were not both Gospels of a life, he would have mentioned this point of contrast clearly. It would be the most notable point; an Apostle who had been with Jesus fails to write a life of Him, and one who was not an Apostle, writes, under the guidance of Peter, an account of what the Lord said and did. There can be no doubt that Papias speaks somewhat slightly of the Gospel of St. Mark, as to its historical completeness, from comparing it with St. Matthew. Mark wrote "accurately what he remembered, but yet not in that order wherein Christ either spake or did them . . . . for he was neither a hearer of the Lord, nor His follower;"[1] but if, of these two, Mark had been the historian of events, and Matthew the compiler of discourses merely, it is inconceivable that the deficiency of Mark should have been spoken of, and not one word should have been said of the utter absence of historical data from St. Matthew. In short, the warrant for making "this cleft through the living body of the Gospel"[2] is inadequate; and there is only this questionable word *logia* to stand between us and the natural interpretation of what Papias says; namely, that as Mark wrote a Gospel, so Matthew wrote one, and in the Hebrew tongue.[3]

[1] Comp. Holtzmann, p. 71.
[2] The passages of St. Mark not found in St. Matthew are not numerous. They are—i. 21–28, 35–39; iv. 21, 24, 26–29; vii. 31–37; viii. 22–26; ix. 38–42; xii. 41–44; xiv. 51, 52.
[3] See Eusebius, iii. 39.
[4] Eusebius, as above.

[1] Eusebius, 'Hist.' iii. 39.
[2] Keim, i. p. 57.
[3] See Professor Lightfoot, 'Contemporary Review' 1875, pp. 398–403, who has discussed this with great power. "St. Paul describes it as the special privilege of the Jews, that they had the keeping of the 'oracles of God' (Rom. iii. 1). Can we suppose that he meant anything else but the Old Testament Scriptures by this expression? Is it possible that he would exclude the books of Genesis, of Joshua, of Samuel and Kings, or only include such fragments of them as professed to give the direct sayings of God? Would he, or would he not, comprise under the term the account of the Creation and Fall (1 Cor. xi. 8, *et seq.*), of the wanderings in the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 1, *et seq.*), of Sarah and Hagar (Gal. iv. 12, *et seq.*)? Does not the main part of his argument in the very next chapter (Rom. iv.) depend much more on the narrative of God's dealings than of His words? Again, when the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers to 'the first principles of the oracles of God' (v. 10), his meaning is explained by his practice, for he elicits the Divine teaching quite as much from the history as from the

Amid the chaos of opinions on this question, one shrinks from trusting to internal evidence. But it does seem that no book was ever less like a patchwork compilation from two different documents, than the existing Gospel of St. Matthew. Even Réville, who sees an "editor" at every turn, admits that the tendency in the Church has always been to quote the sayings and parables of Jesus, by preference, from the first Gospel, even where there was the choice of two parallel accounts, "as if the Christian consciousness had found in it from the first the most adequate expression of its ideal, and the most worthy of Him who had the words of eternal life."[1] Keim finds "the plan of the book careful, simple, transparent, and well sustained to the end."[2] If there has been any editing, he thinks, it has not injured the original character of the Gospel, which he finds to be the oldest and the simplest. Réville admits that the language has one stamp and character throughout. In a word, no one would have started the notion that this work was the production of successive editors, if it had come to our hands alone, with the force of Catholic traditions recommending it to us from the first. It is only from a supposed necessity of accounting for every part of the problem of the Gospel Harmony that this idea of copying has been started, amongst many other devices. Nor is it without wonder that we observe how a criticism, which spares nothing in the divine Word, has treated with deference a word of Papias, doubtful in itself, gathered by hearsay from John the Elder, by one whom Eusebius describes as "a man of very narrow understanding, as it may be conjectured from his books."[3]

§ 12. *Dependence of St. Mark.*—Did St. Mark copy from St. Matthew? This question brings us into the presence of that *opprobrium criticorum*—the true position of St. Mark's Gospel. Up to this moment it is an undecided dispute whether the Gospel of Mark is the common source of those of Matthew and Luke, or an epitome or abridgment of these two; whilst the old traditional opinion which places Mark between Matthew and Luke in point of time has not wanted defenders. And this is the very last word of critical science. Keim sees as clearly that the aim of Mark was to unite the two great Gospels, following in his first main division the guidance of Luke, and in his last that of Matthew; as Reuss and Réville see that St. Mark has the true stamp of originality, and the marks of the companion and scribe of St. Peter. Hilgenfeld, however, is equally certain that the second Gospel is dependent on the first, and quite independent of the third. What conclusions can be drawn from such a variety of results, except that the method itself is at fault? In the hands of Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, Weiss, and others, the minutest analysis of the texts has been made. The patience, the industry, the acuteness in details, demand our admiration. But it may almost be said of the modern school, as it was of Eichhorn and his followers that their most conspicuous service has been that of laying bare, with the skill of the anatomist, all parts of the problem. Any solution worthy of the name of scientific, any which could command universal assent, as resting on grounds of argument which could be conveyed from one mind to another, seems as far off as ever.

§ 13. *Theory of frequent Recensions.*—But it is better to consider the question of priority and originality in connexion with the theory that each Gospel has been the subject of successive recensions and alterations. For almost every one who claims for St. Matthew or for St. Mark the position of being original, demands also to be allowed to explain that a Gospel of Matthew or Mark, somewhat different from the existing book, is the original for which they contend. The marvellous degree of elaboration which this kind of theory

direct precepts of the Old Testament." He then goes on with an argument, equally cogent, from the works of Philo, Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Basil.

[1] 'St. Matthieu,' pp. 1, 2.

[2] 'Life of Jesus,' i. 52.

[3] Eusebius, 'Hist.' iii. 39.

has reached, may appear from Wittichen,[1] who thinks he has established the following :—When the need of a written record forced itself on the Church at Jerusalem, content hitherto with the traditional preaching of the Gospel, which had gradually grown up, three separate writings, embodying the traditional preaching, were drawn up in Palestine, the groundwork of the future Gospels. The earliest of those was probably the original of St. Mark's Gospel. Next to this, and partly dependent on it, the work which was used in common for our present Matthew and Luke; and thirdly, a work used by John alone, and unknown to the compiler of the original Matthew. It is convenient to designate these as A, B, and C. The next step is, that some other writer in Palestine, just before the destruction of Jerusalem, composed a Gospel, by means of A as the groundwork, somewhat altered, however, as to its order, and with a few places omitted; B being employed to furnish several insertions. This Gospel he calls Matthew I. Somewhat later, when Jerusalem had fallen, there was composed, outside of Palestine, a new Gospel, grounded on A, with numerous omissions, in combination with B and C, not without a few additions of the compiler, and with a new introduction. This Wittichen would designate as Luke I.: it is the fifth in the series of contributions. Somewhat later still, the first Matthew was altered in Palestine; the first Luke in Rome. In this edition of Luke, use has been made of Matthew I., and also of the works of Josephus. Both received additions and alterations. Amongst these, a history of the childhood was added to each. The last editor of Luke was also the author of the Acts, and through him this Gospel was used over the districts where St. Paul's preaching had come. The short preface was added by the same hand. Thus our present Gospels according to Matthew and Luke came to completeness, and the number of documents mounts up to seven. Somewhat later, the writing marked A underwent the process of editing, in which a number of small adaptations to the now familiar expressions of Matthew II. were made, and several explanations added. Hence our present Gospel of Mark, the eighth document in the series: happily also the last. The author is even able to assign to C a distinct Pauline tendency, reflected in the derived Luke I.; whereas he discerns in the latest editors of Matthew and Luke, a tendency to Judaism, for they lay stress on the privileges of Israel in the new kingdom of grace. They put forward this version to the heathen of the original apostles (as in Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxiv. 47); and some alterations are made, of expressions having a contrary tendency. The latest Mark, on the other hand, has been treated with a contrary purpose: the Jewish national consciousness recedes, the opposition between Christianity and Judaism becomes sharper, and the rights of the heathen Christians in the new Church are emphatically arrested.

This elaborate structure is only one amongst many. Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Weiss, Réville, Reuss, each has his system of development; and we so far do injustice to them here that we are not able to find room for the analysis by which each arrives at his conclusions. Certainly nothing has been wanting which keen critical observation can do, to lay a foundation for these theories. The work of Holtzmann, in particular, is a remarkable monument of critical industry. So are the two works of Weiss, on Matthew and Mark.

§ 14. *Subject matter of the inquiry.*—But when we are asked to treat thus a work which has been regarded, for seventeen centuries, as the work of one sole and single hand, writing under the Divine guidance; when the picture-cleaner pretends that he can remove the glazing and retouching, which the works received from a third hand at Rome, and then proceed to deal with the repainting bestowed upon it in Palestine, so as to give us at last the original in its simplicity and veracity, some curiosity about the process and the chemicals employed is more than pardonable: it is demanded by the nature of the case.

[1] 'Leben Jesu,' 1876, p. 42, *et seq.*

Here, then, is an example of the materials upon which, and through which, criticism has had to work.

| Mark i. 35. | Luke iv. 42. |
|---|---|
| And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed. 36. And Simon and they that were with him followed after him. 37. And when they had found him, they said unto him. All men seek for thee. 38. And he said unto them, Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also: for therefore came I forth. 39. And he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils. | And when it was day, he departed and went into a desert place: and the people sought him, and came unto him, and stayed him, that he should not depart from them. 43. And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent. 44. And he preached in the synagogues of Galilee. |

There is no parallel passage of St. Matthew.

Now these words of Mark contain several striking points. St. Luke says that the multitude sought Jesus; St. Mark mentions that Simon and the disciples pursued him, told him of the multitudes seeking him, and pressed him to return. The verb "followed" is in the singular in the best MSS, as though Peter followed, with the rest as mere companions; but these, summed up as "the rest," were James, John, and Andrew. The very early rising, and the prayer which was the object of it, are in Mark alone. The proposal to make a circuit in Galilee, the completeness of the circuit, rest on St. Mark's narrative. Mark is very graphic and distinct; Luke more general, yet clear. Matthew is wholly silent. How will criticism deal with these differences? Holtzmann regards this as one of the most decisive proofs of the originality of Mark. He points out how the several points have been obscured in Luke. Wittichen regards the passage of St. Mark as original (in A of his scheme), omitted by St. Matthew as being needless after the Sermon on the Mount. Godet can understand all the differences on the supposition that the two narratives had a common origin in traditional preaching, but not on the supposition that one copied from another. Ernest Bunsen[1] has no doubt that Mark copied from St. Luke, adding a few touches from St. Matthew (viii. 14 f.). Bleek, quite gratuitously, casts a doubt on the accuracy of St. Mark, as though he made the next miracle, of healing a leper, take place in one of the synagogues; for which we cannot find a word in St. Mark's text. He is confident that in the passages that precede and follow this, the healing of Simon's wife's mother, and the cleansing of the leper, Mark had before him the two other Gospels, and used them both.[1] Meyer sees in the mention of Peter's name, the singular verb, and the omission of the other names, the ground of the idea of Peter's pre-eminence; but refuses to see in it any sign of a "Petrine" tendency in the Evangelist.[2] Lastly, Weiss sees an involuntary indication, in this mention of Peter, of the source whence the Evangelist drew his information; whilst he finds clear tokens of the reflecting editor in St. Luke, who passes over the pursuit of the disciples, intensifies the expression of duty, "must preach," and substitutes for the more ambiguous "came I forth," the clearer reference to the heavenly commission, in the words "am I sent."[3] What are we to think of these varieties of opinion, but that the science which arrives at them has not yet reached sure ground? All that is sure is that of two accounts, both exactly in harmony, one is graphic and full of detail, the other more general and with less minute handling. One says that the more general has been formed from throwing off something of the more full; another thinks that in St. Mark we have a later hand, with more literary skill, filling up with skilful touches a narrative that requires this treatment for its literary interest. One hears the voice of Peter here, a living witness of the scene. Another, some mere epitomiser or editor, making his best of the materials at his command. All these cannot be true, and they discredit the method that issues in such confusion.

This is but a small example. How complete is the divergence, may be

[1] 'Hidden Wisdom,' ii. 258.

[1] 'Einleitung,' part i. § 94.
[2] 'Kommentar,' Mark i. 29.
[3] 'Markus-Evangelium,' *in loc.*

gathered from comparing almost any two writers on the subject. Thus Volkmar says, "The much sought for Gospels, 'original Matthew,' 'original Mark,' 'original Luke,' or 'book of sayings,' are mere fancies."[1] Meyer, in his turn, warns us, not without reason, against Volkmar's idea that the Gospel of St. Mark was written as a protest against the Jewish reaction expressed in the Apocalypse; that it combines honour for St. Paul and his doctrines with the scheme of Church government of Peter, and that from it came all other Evangelical narratives, nine in number. He justly characterises this as a mere critical extravagance.[2]

§ 15. *Exaggerated theories.*—In truth the search after "tendencies" of the Tübingen school, and the unlimited manufacture of "original" and "re-edited" Gospels, have obscured the historical facts. The former has magnified a dispute between Paul and Peter, of which perhaps we know as much as can be known, into a kind of moral convulsion of the Church lasting for two centuries. The latter assumes in the early Church an indifference to written records and a disposition to mend and change them, which are quite inconsistent with any theory of inspiration, and which have really no other foundation than the fact that it is convenient to dispose of any passage, adverse to a theory about the book, by assigning it to a foreign hand. It was at one time believed that in Marcion's Gospel were the remains of the original Luke, and that the Gospel of the Hebrews was the original Matthew: but these views are now fully refuted. There remains to us much analysis, minute and skilful, of the sacred text; the premises are abundant and admirable, if we may separate them from the fantastic conclusions; and if we are asked how we dare to challenge conclusions founded on so much study, the answer is that they challenge one another, being contradictory. Another method seems to be needed; one which shall deal reverently and carefully with facts, and shall be most parsimonious as to hypotheses.

[1] 'Evangelien,' p. viii.
[2] 'Markus,' Introduction.

It will be necessary, before any general view is adopted, to examine the facts that concern each of the synoptic Gospels separately.

### The Gospel according to St. Matthew.

§ 16. *The Man.*—In the lists of the Apostles of Jesus (Matt. x.; Mark iii.; Luke vi.; and Acts i.) there is an Apostle of the name of Matthew; in Matt. x. 3 he is called a "publican." There is every probability that the account of the calling of Matthew (Matt. ix. 9) refers to the same person who bears the name of Levi (Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27). The facts are the same, and occur in the same connexion, in all three narratives. He may have been called Levi before he became an Apostle, and Matthew afterwards: there is nothing unusual in the assuming a new name on some important change of position: Peter and Paul are examples of this.[1] In Mark ii. 14 he is called "the son of Alphæus," and as Alphæus was the name of the father of James the Less, some persons have thought that the two were identical. Others have identified him with Lebbæus the brother of James; and Credner, believing that one and the same Alphæus was father of Matthew and of James, remarks that there was thus a near connection of family ties between the Lord and the Evangelist. For all this there is little historical ground. There is not a word about the later life and ministry of Matthew in the Acts of the Apostles, nor in any other part of the New Testament. Nor can reliance be placed on the accounts, some of them vague, and even contradictory, which are given of his labours by later writers. Clement of Alexandria[2] gives the most probable account; that he was given to ascetic practices, and that he preached the Gospel to the Hebrews for fifteen years after the Ascension. Eusebius mentions that he then went to other parts of the world.[3] Whither? Was it to Ethiopia, Macedonia, the

[1] Compare Fritzsche, note on Matt. ix. 9.
[2] 'Pædag.' ii. 1; 'Strom.' vi. 15.
[3] Eusebius, iii. 1.

country of the Euphrates, to the Persians, the Parthians, the Medes, or even to the Anthropophagi? All these find support;[1] all are alike unhistorical. According to Clement of Alexandria he did not suffer martyrdom. Later writers less trustworthy, have given him that honour. All this is very uncertain. He whose narrative of Jesus' life has become the language of the heart to thousands in every land, the first learnt lesson of the young and the last consolation of the aged, has left no record of his own life, from the day that he rose from the publican's desk to follow Jesus. "Among the Evangelists, however, the publican stands first in order, and opens the banner of salvation, even as Mary Magdalene, who had been a sinner, was the first to bring tidings of the resurrection."[2]

§ 17. *Language of the Gospel.* — A very general tradition obtained that St. Matthew wrote a Gospel in the Hebrew or Aramaic dialect. At the head of the line of tradition stands Papias; he was Bishop of Hierapolis, A.D. 118, and was the scholar of Polycarp, or even of St. John, though this is very doubtful. His testimony mounts higher than the date of his own life, since he professes to give what he had heard from older teachers, as Aristion and John the Presbyter. Eusebius says,[3] "But concerning Matthew the following is said, 'Matthew, therefore, composed the oracles in the Hebrew tongue, and every one interpreted them as he was able.'" It is probable, from the position of this passage, that it is a quotation from Papias; but this is not quite certain. There can be no doubt that the "interpreting" refers to the translating from the Hebrew into the better known Greek. The tense no doubt refers to the time when the Gospel was first composed in Hebrew; all that is actually asserted is, that when it was first written, each was obliged to translate it into Greek, there being no Greek version at that time. Professor Lightfoot carries this further: "it implies the existence of a recognised Greek translation, when Papias wrote;" an argument which puts upon this aorist more weight than it can bear.[1] The presumption is that Papias would not have spoken at all of the difficulty of interpreting, if that had long passed away; or at the weakest, that he would have mentioned the existence of an authoritative translation. Irenæus asserts that the Gospel was written in Hebrew. We hesitate to say with Hug, that he is only repeating the statement of Papias. Without multiplying citations, which can be found in Kirchhofer and Bleek, it is sufficient to say that from the first half of the second century downwards, it was the general belief that Matthew wrote for his own people, a Jew for Jews, and that he wrote in the Aramaic, or late Hebrew, language. The testimony of Papias is somewhat tainted, if we admit that he was ignorant of the Greek Gospel according to Matthew, which must have existed, and have been well known in his time, since Justin the Martyr, writing about 140, appeals to that version as to a well-known authority. Probably Papias was on a wrong scent altogether, and shared the mistake of many later writers, of confounding the "Gospel of the Hebrews" with the Hebrew Version of St. Matthew (Hilgenfeld). But still the reasons must be strong, which we could set against the unanimous testimony of ancient writers, that this Gospel first appeared in a Hebrew, or Aramaic, form.

The state of the case may be thus briefly made. For the Hebrew original, the arguments are, (1) The assertion of Papias, that Matthew wrote the divine oracles in Hebrew, but that every one interpreted them as he could. This is confirmed by Origen[2] (A.D. 185 to 254), that the Evangelist "published it in Hebrew, for the use of converts from Judaism:" also by Cyril of Jerusalem[3] (died A.D. 385 or 386), by Epiphanius[4] (died 403), who remarks that Matthew alone wrote the Gospel in Hebrew. And

[1] The original passages are not given here. They may be found in Kirchhofer; Güder, in Herzog's Cyclopædia; Meyer, 'Kommentar;' Morrison on St. Matthew.
[2] Lange.
[3] Eusebius, iii. 39.

[1] 'Contemporary Review,' August, 1875, p. 397.
[2] Eusebius, vi. 25.
[3] 'Catech.' viii.
[4] 'Hær.' xxx. 3.

by Jerome[1] (A.D. 330 to 420), who adds that, "it was not very certain who had afterwards translated the Gospel into Greek." These are only some of the authorities, but enough to shew a wide-spread belief. (2.) It was supposed that this Gospel could be produced. Pantænus, a Stoic, converted to Christ (died 212), travelled in the East, according to Eusebius, as far as to India. He found there the Gospel according to Matthew, in the Hebrew tongue, in the possession of the believers, with whom Bartholomew the Apostle had left it. Jerome mentions the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as used by the Nazarenes in his day, as being "the Gospel according to the Apostles," or as most people suppose, the "Gospel according to Matthew," and he adds that it was preserved in the library of Cæsarea.[2] Twenty years earlier, however, he had spoken more pointedly of the identity of this Gospel preserved at Cæsarea:[3] and between these two periods, he had made a very remarkable statement. "In the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, and *which I lately translated* into Greek from the Hebrew tongue, and which is called by most people the authentic Gospel of Matthew, the man who had the withered hand is described as a mason,"[4] &c. Elsewhere, we are told by Jerome that he translated it both into Greek and Latin. A belief then prevailed that the original Gospel of Matthew, written in Hebrew, was still in existence amongst Ebionites and Nazarenes, under the name of Gospel according to the Hebrews. These two positions may be taken to represent the ancient opinion and tradition on the subject of the language of Matthew. (3.) It would seem to follow that the existing Gospel is a translation of that Hebrew original, the work of the hand, either of the Apostle himself, as many think, or of some one quite unknown.

§ 18. *Objections to Hebrew Original.*—There are, however, strong arguments that shake these positions:—1. Why did Jerome translate into Greek the Gospel of the Hebrews, at a time when the present Greek text undoubtedly existed? If it was the same as our canonical Gospel, a separate translation was needless; if not the same, then a doubt would seem to be thrown on the canonical Matthew, a doubt, however, which no one thought of suggesting. It may be taken as proved, that Jerome found important differences between the two. 2. The quotations given by Jerome, and by other writers from the Gospel of the Hebrews, which have been carefully collected in several modern works, are quite different from our Gospel of Matthew; and though we are bound to allow that points of difference were more likely to be quoted, than points of coincidence, it is clear that a great number of passages, of an apocryphal character, were to be found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. 3. The passage of Papias, on which so much stress has been laid, and upon which, no doubt, several other passages of the Fathers are built, becomes very difficult when it is closely examined. If every one interpreted the Hebrew Gospel as he could—why was it written in Hebrew, since those who could interpret into Greek, could have read Greek? And if it was written in Hebrew for the Jews of Palestine, who knew that language best, it was needless to interpret it into another. It may be doubted whether this remark of Papias, gathered from an earlier informant, and altered in the gathering, meant more than this: that as this Gospel was in Hebrew, and the rest in Greek, those who wished to know it and compare it with the rest, must interpret it into Greek. 4. If the Gospel of the Hebrews were the original of St. Matthew, the whole theory of Schleiermacher, adopted since by so many, that the oracles (*logia*) of St. Matthew meant the "sayings" only of the Lord, must fall to the ground. No one pretends that the Gospel of the Hebrews was limited to sayings and discourses of Jesus; and the fragments that remain are enough to shew us that it was a history, like the rest.[1] 5. There were two forms of the Gospel

[1] 'Catech.' chap. iii.
[2] 'Dialogue against the Pelagians,' ii.
[3] 'De Vir. Ill.' iii. [4] On Matt. xii. 13.

[1] See the passages collected in Kirchhofer, chap. xxxvi.

according to the Hebrews; one the Gospel accepted by the Nazaræans, the other, that of the Ebionites. Epiphanius mentions both, and connects them both with St. Matthew.[1] Each appears to have been somewhat altered from the primitive text. 6. The opinion of Hilgenfeld, that the Gospel according to the Hebrews is itself a translation from a Greek original, rests on very ingenious arguments,[2] which have since been abandoned by the author of them himself,[3] but cannot be set aside. If they prevail, the old Gospel according to the Hebrews may have been written by Matthew, and yet have been posterior to another writing of his in Greek; a possible, if an improbable supposition. The Gospel of the Nazaræans, Holtzmann deems to be, in fact, nothing else than a translated and edited reproduction of the Greek Matthew.[4] "Hardly any one," says Keim, "now believes, with the ancient Church, that the treatise was originally written in Hebrew; it is too decidedly Greek. Most of the quotations from the Old Testament are taken from the Greek, not from the Hebrew version, and a certain Hebrew colouring is characteristic of most of the writers of the New Testament, in consequence of their Jewish extraction." The assertion is too sweeping. Holtzmann[5] gives a long array of recent writers, who, differing much in their conclusions, are agreed that the Gospel as it stands cannot possibly be a translation from a Hebrew original.[6]

[1] 'Hær.' xxix. 9, and xxx. 3. In Anger's admirable Synopsis, which every scholar should possess, the second index guides to all the passages from these two forms that remain to us.

[2] 'Evangelien,' p. 117. Comp. Credner, 'Beiträge,' p. 345.

[3] "Hebræorum evangelium nobis evangeliorum originem investigantibus etiam nunc Archimedis punctum præbet, quod tot viri docti in evangelio secundum Marcum frustra quæsiverunt."—Hilg., 'Evang. secundum Hebræos,' p. 13, 1866.

[4] Page 267.

[5] Page 268.

[6] To that list, which includes Hug, Paulus, Fritzsche, Schott, Credner, Wilke, de Wette, Reuss, Bleek, Ewald, Weiss, Ritschl, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, and Delitzsch, may be added the English names of Alford, Ellicott, Roberts, ('Dissertations on the Gospels'), and Davidson (on St. Matthew).

§ 19. *General Conclusions.* — The general conclusions, then, that seem warranted at present are, That the existence of a Gospel according to the Hebrews, attributed to St. Matthew, is assured by the general voice of ancient tradition; that this Gospel was seen, in one of its two forms, by Jerome, and by him translated into Greek; that the tradition as to its authorship is mainly traceable to Papias; that, so far as this Gospel is known to us, it is not the same as our St. Matthew; that it is probably a secondary work and possibly a translation from Greek sources;[1] that, whatever be the case with the Hebrew Gospel, we have in the canonical St. Matthew a work that has been received from the earliest times as the writing of the Apostle, and that it is not a translation from any Hebrew source. The Gospel, then, was written in Greek.

§ 20. *Language of Palestine.*—We do not here discuss the question so ably agitated by Hug and by Dr. Roberts, as to the original language of our Lord and the Apostles; but the opinion that Greek was in common use in Palestine is not to be dismissed as a mere paradox. Palestine was, like Wales, bilingual. Greek was the tongue of the educated, and Aramaic of the people. Some Englishmen would hesitate to describe precisely the amount of use of English and Welsh in Dolgelly, Bangor, Aberystwith, and Swansea. About the language of Jerusalem, Capernaum, Samaria, and Bethlehem, we should have greater difficulty. Only one of the New Testament books is alleged to have been written in Aramaic; and the remark of Papias seems to indicate an impression that a Syro-Chaldaic book would always be needing an interpreter. But it is too much to say that the case has been made out for the popular use of Greek in Palestine.

§ 21. *Date of the Gospel, before the Destruction of Jerusalem.*—What date

[1] Lessing thought that the Gospel of the Hebrews was the primitive Gospel: Eichhorn thought it must be the nearest to it. Francke, Delitzsch, Ewald, Bleek, Holtzmann, Volkmar, Freytag, Anger, all regard this as a secondary production, and many of them as an adaptation of the canonical St. Matthew. Hilgenfeld, Evang. sec. Hebr. p. 12. Holtzmann, p. 267.

is to be assigned to this Gospel? The ancient authorities tell us that it was written while Peter and Paul preached in Rome (Irenæus), and that Matthew wrote first of all (Origen, and Clement of Alexandria).

Modern writers have altered their views on this subject. Baur, who loved to see in each work the slow product of two "tendencies," a Universalist correcting a Judaising, put the date at 130, without any authority, and without carrying conviction to others. Volkmar places it between 105 and 110. Other writers, flying to the opposite extreme, have placed the date very early indeed: Roberts, 37-41; Townson, in the beginning of 37. The later dates were fixed with a view to find room for the "tendencies," and the "editings" and "re-editings," which the Gospel was said to exhibit, the problem being to take as much time out of the second century as the evidence for the early existence of the Gospel could be supposed to suffer. Hilgenfeld[1] and Bunsen go the farthest in holding that the Gospel underwent constant revision and alteration, and did not assume its final form until after the time of Justin Martyr (say 150). Of this "evangelic Proteus, with its constant metamorphosis,"[2] there is no evidence. But a large class of witnesses begin to see that some time between the years 60 and 70 lies the date of the composition of our Gospel; and the evidence for this is not mere guess-work. There is nothing in the Gospel to hint to us that Jerusalem had already fallen, that the temple was destroyed. The flight of the disciples (Matt. xxiv. 15–20) had not yet taken place. In the great prophecy of Jesus wherein the typical destruction of Jerusalem appears hardly distinguishable in point of "perspective of time" from the judgment of the whole world, there would surely be some word of comment from the Evangelist, if one great portion had been completed and had passed out of prophecy into history, whilst the other remained yet unfulfilled. Some of the sayings call for such comment. The prophecy that the end should come, when the gospel of the kingdom had been preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations (xxiv. 14); the promise that this generation should not pass till all these things were fulfilled (xxiv. 34); the utter surprise with which those calamities should overtake men (xxiv. 36–51); all these receive their most powerful comment when the city of Jerusalem has fallen amidst the horrors of war, and the second scene, behind it, is disclosed to the expectation. Where were all the "able editors" who, according to the Tübingen school, were always at work repairing and trimming the first Gospel? The answer seems to be that the work before us was written before the fulfilment of the prophecy, and whilst Jerusalem was still a city, and the Jews a nation, and the temple God's own house. There are those, indeed, who refuse to admit that Jesus can have prophesied the destruction of the temple, because they wish to exclude every supernatural element from His life. But history should not be pared down for a preconception of this kind. That a surmise or foreboding of the destruction of the temple hung about the early preaching of Christianity is very clear. The Lord used it as a figure of His own resurrection; "destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John ii. 19); and this was made part of His accusation at the last (Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 58). It was part of the indictment of Stephen also: "We have heard him say that Jesus shall destroy this place" (Acts vi. 14). They were false witnesses who said it, but there was some germ of truth in the accusation, as in the parallel one against the Lord. The destruction had been mentioned, to say the least. And what wonder? This whole prophecy, in both its parts, is but an ampler treatment of the picture drawn by Daniel long before: "After threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself: and the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood. And He shall confirm the

[1] So in 'Evangelien.' But in his latest work he places it shortly after the fall of Jerusalem. 'Einleitung,' p. 497.

[2] Holtzmann.

covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations He shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate" (Dan. ix. 26, 27). Upon the whole, the opinion that the fall of Jerusalem was not accomplished when this Gospel was published, has gained ground, and become the general belief; the only reserve being this, that many believe the first draft of the Gospel to have been in existence before A.D. 70, this being afterwards subjected to one or more revisions.[1]

§ 22. *Not long before.*—On the other hand, it is probable that the destruction of the city was not far off. A considerable time between the events of the Lord's life and the writing must have elapsed, or there would be no force in the words, "until this day" (Matt. xxvii. 8, xxviii. 15). Whatever theory we incline to, of the origin of the Gospels, it seems agreed that some time must have elapsed between the Resurrection and the present narratives being prepared; whether the theory of antecedent preaching or of written documents find most favour. In the case of St. Luke, there can be no doubt. Many had taken in hand the history of Jesus (Luke i. 1). The traditions on this point are scanty, and not much to be trusted. Irenæus (iii. 1) tells us that the Gospel of St. Matthew was written whilst Peter and Paul were at Rome;[2] but it has been justly remarked that this is given by Irenæus, not as a contribution to chronology at all,[3] and we must not lay too much stress on it. The tradition that Matthew remained in Palestine for fifteen years after the Ascension, and then departed, would be inconsistent with this. Upon the whole, we are pushed by probabilities on either side towards a date somewhere about 63–65. The social and political condition of Palestine at that time threatened a great crisis. Society was fast declining into anarchy, and there seemed no help from any quarter. There was cogent reason for desiring to secure in a permanent form, for the Jewish converts, the Gospel facts which had so long been preached to them from oral tradition, and perhaps from separate and fragmentary narratives. After the death of Claudius, it needed no great foresight to discern the peril that beset the Jewish nation. Felix, to adopt the bitter conciseness of Tacitus, "amidst every kind of cruelty and lust, exercised the royal office with the soul and spirit of a slave."[1] Long years of mutual mistrust between the conquerors and a proud and sullen race, had made government almost impossible. Two years of honest endeavour on the part of Festus (A.D. 60–62) could do little to recall Judæa from this anarchy. His successor Albinus (62–64) was a mere robber, bent on getting gold from any quarter by any means. When he was recalled, he opened the doors of all the prisons, and "left the prisons empty, but the land filled with thieves" (Joseph. 'Antiq.,' xx. 9. 5). As the candle flame casts a shadow from the lime-light, so did the villainy of Albinus appear dull by the light of his successor's misdeeds. Gessius Florus (A.D. 64–66) was a mere brigand, who had crept into the kingly seat. Josephus can hardly find words to describe his conduct. The misery of the people under this evil succession must have been great: their endurance taxed to the utmost. "How long, O Lord?" It was impossible that this should last. The clouds were gathering so thick that they must at last explode in thunder, and the bolts of heaven must fall. It was probably in this time of feverish expectation that the Gospel before us was brought into a written shape. Parables and images of the great Judgment, not preserved by the other Evangelists, are grouped here by St. Matthew (xxiv. 43; xxv. 46). The words of Jesus, penned by St. Matthew alone, must have seemed strongly prophetic of this troublesome time: "Wherefore if . . . . eagles be gathered together" (Matt. xxiv. 26–28). With a

[1] Thus Schenkel places the date after 70, and Keim before 70, the difference being only that one will not admit an element of prophecy.

[2] Comp. Eusebius, v. 8.

[3] Morrison.

[1] Hist. v. 9.

society about to part asunder, with the constant fear of persecution, the disciples must have become convinced that the precious deposit of the Gospel must no longer be trusted to tradition alone. Matthew is departing; others have gone. And therefore the Apostle gathers into a Gospel the treasure of preaching that the Church possessed. How far did he use materials existing at the time? and how many kinds of them were in existence? To answer these questions is absolutely impossible now. The general strain of Apostolic preaching, as Gieseler thinks, formed the groundwork: it was said, and said again until it had fallen into a fixed form of words. Special reports and written records of this discourse and that journey may have been available: but the attempt to disentangle them is vain, if indeed they are to be sought at all.

§ 23. *Is this the date of the Gospel as we have it?*—Is this approximate date to be considered that of the Greek Gospel, or that of the Hebrew Matthew, afterwards re-edited and translated? The answer is, that all the reasoning that makes it probable that this Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, excludes the notion of any subsequent editing, which would amount to a recasting and reconstruction of the Gospel. There would have been some re-arrangement of the eschatological predictions, so as to distinguish the fulfilled, from that which still awaited fulfilment. And, once more, upon what does this theory of re-editing rest, which has disturbed the vision of so many modern writers? Upon two points. In an obscure quotation, *logia* is held to mean discourses; and, therefore, Matthew wrote the discourses of Jesus only, and the *events* were incorporated from St. Mark; and since "every one interpreted" the Hebrew *logia* into Greek "as he was able," therefore, there was one later Greek translation of Matthew, different from the Hebrew in its substance, as embracing discourses and events too. But the word *logia* does not necessarily, nor even probably, bear this meaning, and Papias evidently knew no difference between the staple of St. Matthew's Gospel, and that of St. Mark; both were Gospel histories of the same kind. And, so far as the remark about the interpreting the Hebrew Gospel is to be pressed, it must be meant to apply to a limited time, for, beyond all doubt the Gospel of St. Matthew, in its Greek form, was in existence when Papias lived. Meantime, we have a right to ask why, if there was all this editing and comparison, extending far into the second century, it was done in a manner so perfunctory. Any editor could have brought the three synoptic Gospels into far closer harmony, with very small trouble or intelligence. If the original Mark was used for the groundwork of St. Matthew's history, why has the later Mark departed from it in so many particulars? Every later hand would have aimed at greater conformity between two or more existing Gospels; the differences that remain ought at least to guard us from the suspicion of a constant process of free editing and alteration.

§ 24. *The Postulate of Time.*—In the longer discourses given by St. Matthew, many sayings are gathered up which are recorded elsewhere in connexion with events that gave rise to them (ch. v.–vii., x., xxiii.). This is consistent with the hypothesis of a separate collection of discourses, but it does not by any means demand it. Nor is it easy to understand how it would be possible to compose a volume of discourses without the framework of events on which the discourses were hung. Indeed, this difficulty has been frankly admitted. Nor has the element of time received sufficient consideration from those who follow theories of redaction. If, for example, the reasons be conclusive for supposing that the Gospel of St. Matthew was written before the fall of Jerusalem, any theory which supposes three or four stages of its composition will find itself pressed to death by the narrowness of the walls wherein it is confined. We require time for the composition (say) of a body of Discourses of the Lord, for in all probability they were used orally in preaching before any one undertook to re-

duce them to writing; then more time is required for the collected work to gather weight of authority sufficient to enable it to be made the groundwork of a fresh book. Suppose that after this the new work, composed of the Discourses and of some historical record of events, has been framed, it too will require time to gain a footing, and to supplant records older but less perfect. Then its Jewish tendency is supposed to require a certain correction from a fresh hand, prepared to present the universal, the Gentile side, of the Divine message. Is there time for all this in the limit of about thirty-five years? Baur was right when he demanded far longer time for his scheme of development; shorten the time, and the scheme is shaken. It is curious to notice that another theory of development is passing through the same trial, the theory of "natural selection" was based upon a postulate of unlimited time; but the researches of Thomson and others forbid the concession of unlimited time, and shew some clear limitations; and, that being so, the theory itself must share the fate of its fundamental postulate.

§ 25. *Character of the Work.*—But, after all, the real answer to any theory of redaction, whether by way of fusing together a book of discourses with a book of events, or by way of correcting a strong Judaizing "tendency" by the milder and less exclusive "tendency" towards universalism, lies in the character of the work itself. A book that had undergone such treatment as Hilgenfeld[1] supposes the first Gospel to have received, would bear marks of being a mere compilation. A strong individuality, and a clear purpose, are inconsistent with such patchwork. But the character of this Gospel is uniform, and very strongly marked. Its object, from beginning to end, is to shew Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews, and to describe "the kingdom of heaven," which He came to found upon earth. The Evangelist wishes his countrymen to recognise in Jesus Christ, in spite of the national rejection of Him, in spite of the darkness in which His ministry closed, the Person to whom the prophets looked, and who fulfilled their words in all that He did and underwent. The phrases "kingdom of heaven" (used thirty-two times), and, "that it might be fulfilled" (used nine or ten times), mark this purpose.

§ 26. *Its Contents and Structure.*—The work is carefully constructed. Apart from the account of the childhood, the ministry falls into two portions; the official life in Galilee, and the preparation for the crucifixion; the Baptism being the introduction to one of these, and the Transfiguration to the other. Each of them begins with a formal announcement of the Evangelist; "from that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (iv. 17); and "from that time forth began Jesus to shew unto His disciples, how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day" (xvi. 21). The one of these stages leads naturally up to the other. Jesus teaches long, and works wonders of love, and then takes account with the apostles of the result of all this activity before He unfolds the history of His suffering. "Whom do men say that I am?" During the latter stage, that of the cross, the activity and the preaching recede before the shadow of the coming events. In the former stage the Sermon on the Mount is put out of its place (comp. Luke), and made the opening of the ministry, for it is the new law of the new "kingdom of heaven," and must be brought into the most prominent place. Then follow (viii. and ix.) proofs of His wonder-working power; then the sending forth by the Shepherd of the people, the Apostles to the children of Israel, to whom the new kingdom was offered (x.). The effect of His work on various classes and places now shews itself: John is in doubt (xi. 1–6); the people are perverse (xi. 18, 19); Chorazin and Bethsaida are harder to convince than Tyre and Sidon (xi. 20–22); the Pharisees, cramped and confined by the glosses of the law, cannot understand the Gospel liberty even a little (xii.).

[1] 'Evangelien,' p. 106.

Now a group of parables of the kingdom of God seems to be the opening of a fresh period; the structure being somewhat the same. First, these parables, answering to the Sermon on the Mount; then new miracles, and even more conspicuous—the two feedings of the multitudes with a little bread (xiv., xv.); and lastly, a fresh account of the results of the teaching, as shewn by various minds: "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am"? (xvi. 13)—"But whom say ye that I am?" (v. 15). This second section has probably for its chief scene a new missionary circuit round Galilee. St. Luke places the parable of the sower in the beginning of such a journey, when, accompanied by the Twelve, and now by certain women also, who had been healed of evil spirits, He passed through the land, carrying with Him the glad tidings of God (Luke viii. 1–5).

Throughout the first great section (iv.–xvi.) the purpose never flags or changes: this kingdom of Messiah is preached to the Jews who were its heirs: thus it was preached, thus it was enforced, and thus received by the ungrateful people; whilst of the darker lessons of the second part, the disciples understood nothing at the end of the first. "Be it far from Thee, Lord, this shall not be unto Thee" (xvi. 22).

The second section, opening with the Transfiguration and the witness from heaven, has its Sermon too; but this time the circle is narrower, to which it is addressed; the disciples who now learn the doctrine of suffering and the cross, are to learn the ethics of suffering also: in the child's humility (xviii. 3, 4); in the tender consideration for the smallest and weakest (xviii. 10–14); in the constant forgiveness of wrongs (vv. 21–35); the strength of His ministers would lie. Miracles follow (xix.–xx.), but they are not so prominent now in the narrative. Again and again the gloomy prophecy of His death is pressed home to the disciples (xvi. 22, xvii. 22, xx. 17–19, xxvi. 1, 2): until at last the fulfilment comes. All the world of Judæa passes, for a kind of judgment, before His judgment seat; scribe and Pharisee, and the doomed Jerusalem, wherein these rule so perversely, are utterly condemned (xxiii.): and through the smoke and fire of the city's destruction may be seen the grand lines of a greater judgment (xxiv. xxvi.).

§ 27. *Objection Answered.*—It may be thought that to ascribe to the Gospel a structure so artificial is to weaken its historical value; that it changes the Gospel from a history into an apology. The answer to this is supplied by a consideration of the Apostles' purpose, and of the mode in which it has been fulfilled. To provide complete memoirs of Jesus was not the intention of any of the sacred writers. "They do not intend to narrate the history of Jesus, but to proclaim the salvation which has appeared on the earth in the Person and the history of Jesus Christ."[1] The Gospels were to be the apostolic preaching in a written shape. The first preaching of the Gospel turned on the facts of a life (Acts ii. 22); and so the facts would appear in the written books, wherein this preaching was fixed and preserved. But the facts were of use for the one common purpose of all the preaching and writing, that of causing men to repent and believe and embrace the Gospel of Jesus. Now, this general purpose is somewhat modified in Matthew, by the wish to turn the Jews to Christ: it is a Gospel written first of all that God's chosen people might believe and receive life from believing. The book is pervaded by this purpose: towards this it moves with a constant progress. The arrangement is not one of artifice; but the whole is moulded by the earnest purpose of the writer. The events are not arranged by any exercise of literary skill; but they fall into their natural places in the Gospel of the kingdom.

§ 28. *Internal Consistency.*—There is, however, a fair test of the historical value of such a book. If the writer is *all* Jewish; if from his Gospel are weeded out things connected with the future reception of the Gentiles into the sphere of God's love, which appear in other gospels; then this bias will no

[1] Keil, p. 3.

doubt affect the estimate of the work. But this is confessedly not the case; and Baur's whole system of interpretation rests on the postulate that there is in our Gospel a universal as well as a judaizing element. The latter he seeks in the original "Gospel according to the Hebrews," and the former in the softening hand of the editor who is supposed to have developed the present Gospel out of it. Why it was necessary to assume that the two elements did not arise in the facts themselves, and why it should be a general principle that one writer can only represent one side of a subject, are questions not quite easy to answer. But at all events the fact is admitted that this Gospel sets forth Jesus as the King of the Jews, and also as the Saviour of the world. And this is one proof, to unprejudiced minds, of its historical character.

"The preaching [of Jesus in this Gospel]" says Keim, whose testimony is the more striking from his free treatment of some parts of St. Matthew, "ever flows forward, from an approaching kingdom to one which has come, and which is to come, from an emphatic utterance of the law to a criticism which ever grows fuller, from the calling of all Israel to the calling of infants, from a calling of the Jews to a calling of the Gentiles, from a preaching of the Messiah to a preaching of the Son, and finally to a preaching of the Cross. The proclamation at Cæsarea Philippi of the Messiah and of His suffering is more clearly arranged in all its parts than in any other Gospel. In the acts of Jesus, the gradations of the miraculous are not to be mistaken, from the first stage of the miracles after the Sermon on the Mount, to the third and fourth in which thousands are fed. The disciples steadily advance from vague admiration to the grand acknowledgment finally made by Peter. The conflict with the people and their leaders is slowly begun: Jesus hopes, the people believe, the Pharisees are in suspense, and Jesus still bears with them; but in the midst of His career a deadly strife is declared on both sides; and Jesus understood by His disciples, who support Him, but misunderstood, hated, and persecuted by the leaders of the nation takes, in the name of God, His destiny of death. The consistency of this representation is plain and extremely simple."[1]

§ 29. *Old Testament Quotations.*—There is one more test of the originality of this Gospel, namely, that which arises from a consideration of the Old Testament quotations. Here an excellent service has been rendered to biblical students by the Rev. D. M. Turpie by his 'Old Testament in the New,'[2] in which all the Old Testament passages found in the New Testament are compared with the Septuagint version, and with the Hebrew Bible. Of the 278 passages examined, about 41 are found in St. Matthew. We are not disposed to lay great stress on the argument to be gathered from those quotations as to the Hebrew or Greek origin of the Gospel. There is certainly no uniform nor exact following of the Hebrew original; nor has that course been taken which a mere translator would have been tempted to prefer—of adopting the passages from the Septuagint that corresponded to the passages in the (supposed) Hebrew Gospel. There is a certain independent treatment of the quotations, to account for which we should have to consider what was the object of the citations, and what was the standard of accuracy aimed at. But Bleek and De Wette have made the important observation that in the citations that occur in the body of the narrative the Septuagint is used; whilst in those which the Evangelist introduces as part of his own reflections, there has been a recourse to the Hebrew. This, however, requires some reservation; the Septuagint has exercised its influence throughout, even where there has been a reference to the Hebrew. The reader may refer to i. 23; ii. 15; ii. 18; ii. 23; iv. 15, 16; viii. 17; xii. 17–21; xiii. 35; xxi. 5; xxvii. 9. The last passage is a free treatment of the original, from which it departs widely, in words at least; yet it

[1] Keim, i. 53.

[2] London, 1868. Mr. Sanday allows himself to speak somewhat slightingly of Mr. Turpie's scholarship; without apparent reason. It may be wished that we had more such labourers.

is manifest that the Hebrew was used here, and the Septuagint declined. The inference, from a general consideration of these passages is, that the writer of them is a Jew, to whom both the Hebrew and the Greek versions were accessible, and who adhered, with one or two exceptions, to the Hebrew text in preference.[1]

But the inference from this use of the Hebrew, taken with the prominence given to the Septuagint, in passages which occur in the body of the narrative, would seem to be that the narrative part, at least, is no translation from a Hebrew original. Two explanations seem to suggest themselves; that of Hug and of Dr. Roberts—that Greek was the usual language of Palestine at that time, and that the citations were first made in Greek by Jesus and His disciples, who, though having the command of both tongues, were accustomed to hold intercourse in Greek; and, as an alternative, that when Matthew composed the Gospel, the substance of the narrative had already taken a Greek form and shape, whether as oral preaching or as some written document. Either supposition is adverse to the theory of a precedent Hebrew version of our Gospel. The argument of Dr. Roberts on the subject of the language of Palestine seems inconclusive [see p. xxii above]. The Greek tongue was much diffused, Palestine was bilingual. The educated classes had the command of both. But the question is, which would be used amongst themselves, in familiar intercourse, by the children of the people. "We learn English, and can speak it," said a Welsh carpenter; "but we never use a word of it in conversation except when some Englishman wishes to converse with us." This is a natural instinct, to keep the exotic speech for exotic use; and in the case of the Jews the affinity of their speech with the language of their holy books would be a far stronger tie to their vernacular tongue. But thus far we may go, that if the present Gospel were but a translation, both classes of quotations—those which occur in the narrative, and those which are introduced in the writer's reflections—would be handled in the same way.

§ 30. *Authorship.*—The authorship of this Gospel has been assigned by the universal voice of antiquity to the Apostle Matthew. Modern criticism, led by Schulz,[1] has brought doubts on this: and an opinion prevails in some quarters, that, though there may have been a Gospel written by the Apostle Matthew, which may have been used more or less in the composition of the present Gospel, the present work has not an Apostolic origin. The arguments of Schulz, well answered by Fritzsche,[2] are somewhat fine-drawn. Why, for example, should not an Apostle have used such a general form as that in Matt. iv. 25 and that in ix. 35 in summing up a great mass of acts of Jesus, which he could not notice in detail? The omission of a name or names, in Matt. xx. 30, is also thought to be a proof of the want of that knowledge which a companion would have had. But the name was of no importance to the purpose of the Gospel, and the supplying of a name or of other minor particulars is quite as much the mark of a later writer, trying to confirm and complete a history, as it is of the first writer. That events or sayings are twice repeated, that the chronological order is lost in general expressions, such as "in those days," "then," and names of persons lost in "a certain man," "a woman," and the like: these seem hardly relevant to the position that the Gospel was not written by an Apostle's hand. It is admitted that twenty or thirty years had elapsed; and, if the matter is to be argued apart from all questions of inspiration, it might be possible that some names were less remembered, and some names less worth recording than had once been the case. The repetition of similar events is what actually occurs in any life: there is no wonder whatever that the Pharisees, who were much concerned about the claims of Jesus, should ask at one time for a "sign" and at another for "a

[1] Holtzmann, p. 259. De Wette, 'Einleitung,' pp. 198, 199. Köstlin, p. 38. Turpie, *passim*.

[1] 'Die christliche Lehre vom heiligen Abendmahl.' [2] In Matt.

sign from heaven" (Matt. xii. 38; xvi. 1). And where the chronology seems to be at fault, the explanation seems to be that the general purpose of the Evangelist is to give a picture of Jesus rather than a chronicle of his life; and that whilst the latter was neither present to his mind nor promised by his words, the former has been given with abundant brightness and clearness.

§ 31. *Objections.*—It is alleged, however, against the Apostolic origin of the Gospel, that marks of a change of purpose, or rather of two different purposes, are to be found in it. It is supposed that the older element in it was written when Christianity was offered to the Jews alone, and when Christ was conceived of as the Messiah of the Jews; but that a newer element was incorporated, representing the wider view of the purpose of Christianity, that prevailed after the preaching of Paul had taken effect, in which the rights of the Gentiles were recognised, and the fold of the Lord was opened to "all nations." In support of this view, the exhortation not to cast pearls before swine (vii. 6); the announcement that the Apostles should not have gone through the cities of Israel before the Son of Man should come (x. 23) are thought to belong to the Jewish element; and the threats to the unbelieving Jews that the heathen should be called instead (xiii. 11; xxi. 43); the announcement of His return after the Gospel should have been preached to all the world (xxiv. 14); and the express commission to the Apostles to baptize and admit people of all nations (xxviii. 19); are supposed to betoken the presence of a different hand, guided by wider aims. The two accounts of the centurion from Capernaum (viii. 5) and of the woman of Canaan (xv. 21–28) are alleged to be opposed in the same way. But in order to support this view, we ought to maintain, as indeed Strauss does not hesitate to do, (1) that there are "contradictions" in the narrative which makes some such hypothesis necessary. The mere fact that there are passages in a work in which opposite ideas are expressed and contrasted is no surprise to us, for all history, all processes of thought, are made up of these antinomies—these opposing elements, which must find their conciliation in fact. Now the line of thought in St. Matthew is very clear and complete in itself. Jesus is the Messiah of the Jews; He offers Himself to them as such, not in word alone, but in works of power, and signs and wonders. To the Jews, and to none other, belongs the inheritance of the kingdom, until they shall have had full time to accept or reject it. That time of probation begins with the preaching of the Apostles; it ends with the rejection of the Jews, so pathetically deplored by Jesus (xxiii. 37): but that rejection is made manifest when Jerusalem, abandoned by the Christ whom she has abandoned, is utterly destroyed. "You shall not have completed the circuit of the towns of Israel before the Lord shall come to judge Israel;" this we take, with Schott, to be the meaning of Matt. x. 23. But with this offering to the Jews of the tidings of the kingdom, there must always have been present the idea of a possible rejection by the Jews, and of the consequences that must follow from that. That Messiah should be a blessing to all the nations was no new idea: it was the constant note of prophecy. He was to become so through the acceptance of the Jews; but if they reject Him God's purposes are not on that account to fail. And St. Matthew is as clear on the one point as on the other. Not until the "house is left unto her desolate" do the direct rights of the Gentiles to the word of salvation come into view. Since they cannot be saved through the Jews, they shall be saved without them. "Go ye and teach all nations." The case of the centurion is not a happy selection of a fact to prove a Gentile "tendency" in this Gospel, for it is plain that he was treated as at least a friend of God's people: he had more than the faith of a Jew, to which Jesus Himself bears witness: "I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel" (viii. 10); and he shewed the works of a Jew, for "he loveth the nation, and hath built us a synagogue" (Luke vii. 5): he was treated as a child of the kingdom.

§ 32. *Summary.*—In fact it is by this wholeness of impression, this unity of purpose, this broad and vigorous picture of Jesus, as at once the Messiah of prophecy, and the loving, suffering Saviour of the world, that the authority of St. Matthew as an authentic history is vindicated. It is not pretended that this impression will prevail, with those who open the book with their minds pre-occupied with a theory of *Logia*, or with a wondrous touchstone called *tendency*; minds already in possession of these "idols of the cave" are not the best judges in such a matter. One sees in the baleful influence of that one idea of Schleiermacher that Matthew compiled a work consisting of discourses of Jesus only,—a notion utterly strange to all Christian antiquity, and utterly destitute of modern evidence,—how deeply acute and learned minds may be biassed by preconceptions derived from those about them. This air-drawn theory haunts a succession of eminent writers, down to Reuss. One sees how necessary it may be to recommence the task of criticism by escaping from all theological prepossessions, and by applying to the work in hand reverence, candour, and good sense. Leaving the closer air of the study and going out into the broad field of the Church, we find that this most ancient Gospel has acquired, and has kept the confidence of the faithful in all ages; and the test they have applied to it is, if a rough one, still decisive; the Gospel shews us Jesus, whom we seek. What more can be said for a book than that it has been received universally by the Church as a production of the first age of Christianity, that it has been attributed unanimously to the author whose name it bears, and that its contents are a firm and complete tracing of the likeness of the Lord of Life? Criticism is of course possible on all these points; it may make work for itself anywhere: nay, its work may be useful anywhere to a certain degree. But perhaps one of its uses is to teach us what it cannot do: and here its witness agrees not together. According to divers writers, Matthew is the oldest writer and not the oldest; a Greek writer, but a Hebrew; his work the foundation of the Gospel of Mark, but drawn from that earlier simpler record; it is the work of an Apostle, but there are positive reasons against regarding it as from an Apostle's hand. Its line of teaching is clear and consistent; yet with skilful knife we can dissect out the various fibres of tendencies which make it so manifold and so little consistent with itself. Its unity is self-evident; and yet it never continued for two decades the same, so active were the editors in making it afresh. Its inconsistencies with the other Gospels start out to careless eyes: and yet many hands were constantly at work bringing one Gospel to bear on another, and altering each by the light of the other. These being the results, we have a right to suspect the method: it is even allowable to doubt whether there can be any true principles on which results so discordant can be based.

## THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.

§ 33. *John Mark.*—The name Mark (= *Hammer*?)[1] was the surname of John (Acts xii. 12) who is usually supposed to have been the author of this Gospel. Grotius maintains the contrary, on the ground that the earliest writers nowhere call the Evangelist by the name of John, and that they always describe him as the companion of Peter and not of Paul. But John was the Jewish name, and Mark, a name of frequent use amongst the Romans, was adopted afterwards, and gradually superseded the other. Indeed we can almost trace the process. The John Mark of Acts xii. 12, 25, and the John of Acts xiii. 5, 13, becomes Mark only in Acts xv. 39, Col. iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 11, Philem. 24. The change of John to Mark is analogous to that of Saul to Paul; and the abandonment of the earlier for the later name is connected in both cases with the change of religion and the commencement of a new life. [See above, p. xix.] There is no inconsistency in the view that he may have minis-

[1] Morrison on Mark, who quotes Fick, 'Vergleich. Wörterbuch.'

tered to two Apostles, Peter and Paul. His desertion of Paul, in his missionary journey, may have been caused partly by a wish to rejoin Peter and the Apostles preaching in Palestine,[1] partly by the fear of a perilous journey, partly by a sense of less fitness for the one kind of labour than for the other. That there was a connexion between Peter and Mark is plain from Acts xii. 12, when Peter, freed from prison, is represented as going at once to the house of Mary the mother of John Mark, "where many were gathered together praying." The old writers are severe upon the motives of this desertion; but St. Paul assigns none, though he evidently blames the turning back; and we are justified in supposing that the motives in this case, as indeed in most others, were mixed. Probably John Mark was converted by Peter, from meeting him at some time in his mother's house, for he speaks of "Marcus my son" (Col. iv. 10).[2]

John Mark was the son of one Mary, who dwelt at Jerusalem. There he was probably born (Acts xii. 12). He was the cousin of Barnabas (Col. iv. 10). The theory that he was one of the seventy disciples has no warrant. Another theory, that an event of the night of our Lord's betrayal, related by Mark alone, is one which befell himself (Olshausen, Lange) may be worthy of mention; though Casaubon warns us that it is curious and vain to seek a name which the Evangelist himself has not preserved. "There followed Him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him, and he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked" (Mark xiv. 51, 52). This may have been recorded by Mark with a deep private interest, as marking a night which was a turning-point in his own life: but then it may be only one of those additional touches in which the narrative of Mark abounds, introduced to shew that the persecutions were so keen and pressing that, after the flight of the Apostles, they tried to seize even a chance bystander. All we can venture to say is that if the name of Mark but be supplied here, the transaction receives a clear explanation; and that John (John i. 40, xix. 26) introduces himself in a like unobtrusive fashion, as also perhaps Luke (Luke xxiv. 18). Mary the mother of Mark seems to have been a person of some means and influence, and her house a rallying-point for Christians in those dangerous days. Her young son, already an inquirer, would soon become more anxious to work for Christ. He went with Paul and Barnabas as their "minister" on their first journey; but at Perga, as we have mentioned, he turned back (Acts xii. 25, xiii. 13). On the second journey St. Paul would not accept him again as a companion, but Barnabas his kinsman was more indulgent; and thus he became the cause of the memorable "sharp contention" between them (Acts xv. 36–40). Whatever were the reasons for Mark's infirmity of purpose, they did not separate him for ever from Paul, for we find him at the side of that Apostle in his first imprisonment at Rome (Col. iv. 10, Philem. 24). St. Paul speaks of a possible journey of Mark to Asia. Somewhat later he is with St. Peter at Babylon (1 Peter v. 13). Some have considered Babylon to be a name given here to Rome, in a mystical sense: surely without reason, since the date of a letter is not the place to look for a figure of speech. Of the journey to Babylon we have no more evidence; of its date, causes, results, we know nothing. It may be conjectured that Mark journeyed to Asia Minor (ch. iv. 10), and thence went on to join Peter at Babylon. On his return to Asia he seems to have been with Timothy at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him, during his second imprisonment, and Paul was anxious for his return to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 11).

When we leave the ground of Holy Scripture, we find the facts doubtful and even inconsistent.

If Papias be trusted (quoted in Eusebius, 'H. E.' iii. 39), Mark never was a personal follower of our Lord; which he probably infers from 1 Pet. v. 13. Epiphanius, on the other hand, adopts the tradition that he was one

[1] Kuinöl *in loco*.

[2] Some, as Credner, suggest that this should be taken to apply to natural relationship: this is improbable.

of the seventy, who turned back from Jesus at the hard saying in John vi.[1] The same had been said of St. Luke. The relation of Mark to Peter is of great importance for an estimate of this Gospel.

§ 34. *St. Mark and St. Peter.*—Ancient writers, with one consent, make the Evangelist the interpreter (*hermeneutes*) of the Apostle Peter.[2] Some explain this word to mean that the office of Mark was to translate into the Greek tongue the Aramaic discourses of the Apostle;[3] whilst others adopt the view that Mark wrote a Gospel, which conformed more exactly than the others to Peter's preaching, and thus "interpreted" it to the Church at large.[4] Probably the word "interpreter" means here what it usually means, that the person so called came between a speaker in a foreign tongue and his hearers: and Bleek well remarks that Latin was probably the language which Mark possessed and Peter lacked, so that Mark, having acquired it in his attendance on Paul, was able to interpret for Peter, when he came to Rome, in the language of the people.

The words of Papias, quoted in Eusebius, do not dispose of this question. "This also [John] the Elder said: Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote down exactly whatever things he remembered, but yet not in the order in which Christ either spoke or did them: for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord's, but he was afterwards, *as I [Papias] said*, a *follower of Peter.*" The words in Italics refer to the word "interpreter" above. Some confusion has arisen from supposing that Papias means to describe the writing of a Gospel as the mode in which the interpreter's duties were performed: but this is not so. Papias rather means "Mark, as Peter's interpreter, had opportunities of hearing and knowing what he taught, and wrote it down accordingly." The report that Mark was the companion of Peter, at Rome, is no doubt of great antiquity. Clement of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius as giving it for "a tradition which he had received of the Elders from the first."[1] But some have suspected that this tradition rests on a misunderstanding of 1 Pet. v. 13, Babylon being wrongly taken for a typical name of Rome.[2] Sent on a mission to Egypt by Peter, Mark there founded the church of Alexandria, and preached in various places; then returned to Alexandria, of which church he was bishop, and suffered a martyr's death. But none of these details rests on a sufficiently sound authority.

§ 35. *The Gospel.*—Entering upon a consideration of the Gospel which bears St. Mark's name, we are confronted at once by the great controversy about the Gospels—what is the position of St. Mark towards the rest? If we set aside Christian tradition, this question must be answered by internal evidence; of all evidence the most slippery and tempting. Not without use is Meyer's caution,[4] that in examining single passages to prove the dependence of Mark, or his independence of the others, the greatest caution is required, lest we only find in the passages what we bring to them from our own critical point of view. He points to the modern controversy in proof of this; the passages on which one relies in support of his view are just those which the next opponent turns against him, according to the subjective colouring that each can throw on the passage. Perhaps the wildest excursions of this subjective fancy are in connexion with the theory that there were two Marks, an "Original Gospel" and our present Gospel. If there were the slightest historical evidence that there had ever been a second, or rather an earlier Mark, we should be bound to examine it. In the case of St. Matthew there is the state-

[1] Cont. Hær. t. i. 6, p. 457. Ed. Dindorf.
[2] Papias in Euseb. 'H. E.' iii. 39. Irenæus, 'Hær.' iii. 1; iii. 10, 6; Tertullian, c. Marc. iv. 5; Jerome ad Hedib. ch. xi.
[3] Eichhorn, Bertholdt, &c.
[4] Valesius, Alford, Lange, Fritzsche, Meyer.

[1] H. E. vi. 14; Clem. Alex. Hyp. 6.
[2] Eusebius, 'H. E.' ii. 15; Hieron. de Vir. Ill. 8.
[3] Epiphanius, 'Hær.' 51, 6, p. 457, Dindorf; Eusebius, 'H. E.' ii. 16; Hieron. de Vir. Ill. 8; Niceph. 'H. E.' ii. 43.
[4] Markus, p. 7.

ment of Papias that there was a Hebrew Gospel, confronting the fact that only a Greek Gospel exists: there is nothing of the kind in the case of St. Mark. History tells of one Mark, not of two; if the existence of a second is to be proved, and its nature and contents indicated, there is nothing to rely on, save internal evidence. But the same internal evidence enables Ewald, Weisse, and Holtzmann to construct an original Mark, richer and fuller than the present Gospel; whereas in the hands of Weiszäcker it contracts the original document to narrower limits than the present Gospel. When this point is arrived at of relying on evidence that can prove black or white, the time has come for confessing that the limit of discussion is reached, and the time for wise silence has arrived. In the meanwhile there is another force of internal evidence, far less subtle and far more trusty, and more popular, which tells us that the Gospel of St. Mark has a clear and well marked unity of its own, quite excluding the notion that it is a mere compendium of some richer Gospel or an expansion of some briefer. Our business then is with the Gospel before us, and not with some document that has never been produced, and of which all history denies the existence.

§ 36. *Contents of the Gospel.*—The contents of the Gospel may be divided generally into four sections: I. the Introduction, i. 1–13. II. the works of Jesus, the Son of God, in Galilee, i. 14; ix. 50. III. a journey to Jerusalem and residence there, x. 1; xiii. 37. IV. the sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord.

When this Gospel is compared with St. Matthew the difference of treatment is very manifest. The constant reference to the fulfilment of prophecy, the long and frequent discourses of Jesus have disappeared. No one could maintain that the first object of this Evangelist was to display Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews. The Sermon on the Mount, a kind of giving of a new law on a new Sinai, is omitted. Written for Gentile readers, as it is admitted to have been, words that might seem to limit salvation to the children of Abraham find no place; and passages of an opposite kind come into prominence. The omissions of facts and words are both numerous and important. The genealogy and history of the birth; the strong rebuke by the Baptist (Matt. iii. 7–10); the Sermon on the Mount (v.–vii.); the centurion at Capernaum (Matt. viii. 5–13); the calling of certain disciples (Matt. viii. 19–22); the healing of the two blind men, and of the dumb demoniac (Matt. ix. 27–34); a great portion of the commission to the Apostles (Matt. x. 15–42); the embassy of the Baptist to Jesus, with the Lord's discourse thereupon (Matt. xi.); the asking of a sign (Matt. xii. 38–45); several parables (Matt. xiii. 14–17, 24–30; 33, 35–52); some miracles of healing in the neighbourhood of Gennesaret (Matt. xiv. 34–36); the tribute money (Matt. xvii. 24–27); the discourse about offences (Matt. xviii. 10–35); the parable of the labourers (Matt. xx. 1–16); the miracles of healing in the Temple (Matt. xxi. 14–16); the parable of the two sons (Matt. xxi. 28–32); of the marriage feast (Matt. xxii. 1–14); the discourse upon the Pharisees, almost entirely (Matt. xxiii.); the discourse upon future judgments, in great part (Matt. xxiv. 37 to xxv. 46, except xxiv. 42–44); the fate of Judas the betrayer (Matt. xxvii. 3–10); the setting a watch at the grave (Matt. xxvii. 62–66, xxviii. 11–15); the promised appearance of the risen Lord in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 16–20); all these are omitted by Mark. What he has retained, however, is rather lengthened than abridged; so that the mere wish for brevity cannot account for the variations. On the other hand, there is a kind of compensation for these omissions, in the frequent touches of a more minute or vivid description, which he introduces even where in other respects his narrative coincides minutely with that of St. Matthew. Names quoted by the one are supplied by the other (as v. 22, x. 46, xv. 21, 40); looks and expressions of countenance of the Lord are mentioned (as Mark iii. 5, vii. 34, viii. 12). Numbers are minutely specified (as v. 13, vi. 37, xiv. 15). It has always been supposed, that there was some con-

nexion between the Apostle Peter and the Evangelist; and it may well be that many of these touches are reminiscences of the preaching of Peter, which Mark had been so often called to interpret. However that may be, they do invest his Gospel with a stamp and features of its own. With very little of independent subject-matter, there is an independence of treatment; and those who maintain that Mark had one or both the other Gospels before him must confess that he is no mere abbreviator of existing narratives.

§ 37. *Peculiar Features of the Gospel.*—Indeed the key to this Gospel seems to be that the writer was minded to write an account of the wonderful life and power of Jesus the Son of God.[1] He conveys, and in a marked manner, the shortness of the time in which all was transacted, and the rapidity and wonderful activity of this great life. Doctrinal discourses are foreign to this purpose. The relation of Jesus to the Jewish Scriptures is likewise made less prominent. The word "straightway" or "immediately" is used forty-one times in this shortest Gospel; a marked peculiarity. The wonder-working Son of God[2] sweeps over His kingdom, swiftly and meteor-like: and men are to wonder and adore. His course is sometimes represented as abrupt, mysterious, awful to the disciples: He leaves them at night; conceals Himself from them on a journey. The disciples are amazed and afraid (x. 24, 32). And the Evangelist means the same impression of awe to be imparted to the reader.

Periods of solitude and rest are interposed in this stormy, hurried life. "The Evangelist makes the histories more effective by the contrast between the hurried progress . . . . and the contemplative stillness in which he paints the scenery with a thousand touches—the house, the sea, the followers, the growing throng, the persons by name, the numbers of men, of beasts, of coins, the green grass, the pillow on the stern of the boat on Gennesareth, all described with the ready use of softening diminutives, and with words of time that denote the present."[1] He seems to say, "Behold the Son of God! See His work, His power, His authority, and believe on Him." Thus it comes that the Evangelist whose subject-matter is so occupied by other writers that a few verses suffice to contain what is peculiar to him, vindicates to himself a special place and purpose, and his own tones blend into the fourfold hymn of praise, distinct yet harmonious with the rest.

It is true that some speak slightly of this picture of what is called a "restless" career, and contrast it with the calmer and more sculpture-like representation which they pretend to find in St. Matthew. But are we not obliged to see that the sketch in the second Gospel must be true to history? The constant persecutions, from which it was needful to flee, even sometimes beyond the bounds of Herod's kingdom, to Tyre, or to some solitary spot on the sea-shore; the crowds that followed Him in wonder, forgetful of food and shelter, that they might see with eyes what others told in their ears; the pitiable cases of sickness and mutilation from which that loving eye is never turned away, the constant presence of the twelve disciples, with all their doubts, and crude beliefs, and problems to solve: a life made up of such elements must have been one of constant pressure, not indeed of "hurry" in the usual sense of the word; for if there is one truth more than another that we may learn from the lives of those who have lived by the Spirit of God, it is that the soul may be kept in peace in the midst of great outward pressure. Hence, whether this Gospel is pronounced an early or a late work, wholly dependent or partly derived, it does appear that its representation is true and faithful, if only it be granted that Jesus lived, and that in a ministry of three

[1] As St. Paul says that the Gospel was not a new philosophy, but "the power of God" (Rom. i. 16), so Mark shews with what a manifestation of "power" and "authority" it took its rise (i. 22, 27; ii. 10; v. 30; vi. 2; vi. 5). See Grau, i. p. 125.

[2] We must not forget that the words "Son of God" in the beginning of this Gospel are not in the Sinaitic MS. They may not be genuine; but they do not affect this argument.

[1] Keim.

years He went about teaching, and preaching, and healing, the object of constant persecution, yet never abating His zeal on account of His enemies.

§ 38. *Relation of this Gospel to St. Peter.*—What was the relation of the Evangelist to St. Peter? The passage of Papias, quoted by Eusebius, is: "Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately, though not in exact order, what he remembered of the things that Christ either spoke or did."[1] This certainly does not mean that he acted as amanuensis of Peter, writing down a Gospel at his dictation: the phrase "what he remembered," is against that view. Nor does the passage bind us to believe that the Gospel was written in Peter's lifetime; the probability is that it was not. Many have argued that the phrase "not in exact order" is inapplicable to our Gospel, which is as orderly in arrangement of events as the rest. But the meaning of Papias is apparent from what follows: "for he was neither a hearer of the Lord, nor had he ever been His follower; but, as I said, he was the follower of Peter at a later time, who used to preach his instructions with a practical purpose, and not for the purpose of making a collection of the Lord's discourses. So that Mark was not in fault in writing down some things as he remembered them: for he was careful about this one thing, namely, to omit nothing that he had heard, and not to let anything false be mixed with them." It seems from this report of Papias, not in truth a very clear reporter at any time, that Mark acted as interpreter for Peter (see p. xxxiii), which gave him opportunities of hearing Peter's preaching. His preaching was practical, and was not framed for any purpose of writing a complete Gospel; but it taught Mark many things, and he undertook to write them down; but not a complete Gospel, from which nothing was omitted, though an exact and accurate document in regard to the things which he did narrate. Without attempting to go over the passages of the Fathers which establish the existence of the tradition as to Mark's connexion with Peter, we may

[1] Euseb. iii. 39.

glance at the well-known passage of Justin Martyr [about 140–150], where he records that the Lord changed the name of the Apostle to Peter, adding that this is recorded in "his Memoirs." But the word "his" may refer either to the name of our Lord or to that of Peter: if to Peter, then the Gospel in which alone this change of name is recorded, would be described, not as connected with Peter, but as "his:" if, as seems rather more probable, to the Lord Himself (who is called "Him" just before in the same sentence), then the interest of the passage for us is that it is a quotation in Justin from St. Mark. The circumstances of St. Mark's life make this connexion with St. Peter very probable. If there was also a belief in ancient times that Mark was a companion of, and influenced by, Paul and Barnabas, there does not seem to be any contrariety between these two traditions. But for the belief in the connexion of Mark with an Apostle, the ancient Church would have hesitated to admit this Gospel into the canon of Holy Scripture. There does not appear to be any reason to doubt that the tradition which connects Peter and Mark, and which assigns to the former some influence upon the Gospel, is well founded.[1]

§ 39. *Various Opinions on the Position of St. Mark's Gospel with reference to the others.*—What was the amount of influence? That question can hardly be answered without an attempt to ascertain the position of the second Gospel with reference to others. How great the difficulty of this question is, may be gathered from the conflicting results that have been reached. Taking up two of the most recent works on the subject, we read from Hilgenfeld[2] "the

[1] The passages of the Fathers are collected in Kirchhofer. See also Fritzsche on St. Mark, Prolegomena. It must be remembered that the tradition of Peter's preaching in Rome is connected with the supposition that "Babylon" is used as a name for "Rome" (1 Pet. v. 13; conf. Revel. xiv. 8). "Peter mentions Mark in his former epistle, which, as they say, was written at Rome. Peter himself intimates thus much, calling Rome in a figure Babylon." Eusebius, H. E. ii. 14; so also Nicephorus H. E. ii. 15; and Hieron. de Vir. Ill. 8.

[2] 'Einleitung,' p. 505.

thoroughgoing dependence of the Gospel of Mark on the Gospel of Matthew as we have it is undeniable;" and from Reuss,[1] "We think we have shewn by the analysis of all the texts that we have cited hitherto that those of Mark have everywhere the stamp of originality, whilst those of Matthew present numerous and various signs of the revision of a second hand." Keim finds that the Gospel of Mark aims at uniting the two great Gospels; that in his first main division Mark chiefly takes Luke for his foundation; in the second, Matthew.[2] Volkmar, who begins his work on the Gospels by laying as his foundation "the text of the oldest of the four great Gospels, that of Mark,"[3] sees that the second Gospel is a work of a Pauline spirit and tendency, aimed against the Judaic tendency of the Apocalypse. Hilgenfeld[4] strongly denies this, points out the passages which shew the Jewish side of this Gospel, and insists that, so far from its being the expression of the one tendency or the other, it is rather a conciliation and harmony of the two principles, represented by Peter and Paul, of Christianity for the Jews and Christianity for the heathen, and that it marks the solution of that controversy which began with the dispute between Peter and Paul (Gal. ii. 11) on the treatment of the heathen converts.

The natural conclusion from such passages is that writers have mistaken the nature of the evidence, and that what appears to them conclusive ought not to have been so regarded. Science, whether physical or historical, arrives at sure results. There are, it is true, periods of controversy in which the evidence on one side or the other is assailed, doubted, refused; but to such controversies succeed times of conviction, in which it becomes admitted on all sides that a definite result has been reached, or at least that there is before it a problem which cannot be resolved at all upon the evidence. Criticism has not reached that stage; it goes on still, over-rating the evidence, insisting on the universality of its own partial inductions, and too often trying to compensate the felt weakness of the arguments by wrath and hard words.

§ 40. *St. Matthew and St. Mark.*—The problem then is—How far does the Gospel of St. Mark, *as it is*, shew the influence of either of the other two Synoptic Gospels, *as they are?* "Sources," "recensions," "original Marks," cannot be compared, because in fact none of them exist, and in imagination far too many. As to St. Matthew, it is admitted, even by Keim, that any later alterations in it must be few and insignificant, and that the Gospel as we have it was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem. Is there anything in this Gospel, and in St. Mark, which proves that one must be dependent on the other? First, as to the historical order: in the first part of the history Mark coincides with St. Luke, whereas Matthew, in the position of the Sermon on the Mount, and that of some miracles, has an order of his own. In the second part of the history Mark has the same order as Matthew. The coincidences of language are so great between the two Evangelists, that it is difficult to believe that the two written records are entirely independent of each other, and only possess a common oral ground-work. And of the various theories to account for these resemblances, that which seems the least difficult is that which, assigning to Mark the middle place in chronological order, regards his Gospel as founded on that of St. Matthew and not on that of St. Luke. To develope this at length would require a volume; Weiss and Volkmar have each devoted a volume to St. Mark, arriving, however, at different conclusions from ours, and each conclusion differing from the other. The point of view of St. Matthew throughout his Gospel is that Christ the Lord is the Messiah of the Jews, and also the Saviour of the world; the message of salvation was to the Jews first, but not to the exclusion of the heathen. Those who pretend that it is a polemical book for the Judaizing view of Christianity, or a work created by altering such a book, and by infusing a milder element, have not reason on their side, and they do

[1] 'Histoire évangélique.'
[2] 'Leben Jesu,' vol. i.
[3] 'Evangelien,' Introd. p. xii.
[4] P. 518.

in fact answer one another. Now in St. Mark there is a different point of view—admiration for the wonder-working Lord and Son of God. This is faithfully and consistently preserved. Comments on the fulfilment of prophecy now become fewer, or almost disappear. The position of the chosen people is less insisted on; the work to be done has more reference to the world at large. The difference of object, however, in the Gospels is by no means wholly due to a chronological interval, and to a consequent development of the plan of the Holy Spirit for the Church: if it be supposed that this Gospel was written at Rome, and for the use of Gentiles chiefly—and the explanations of Jewish customs and the free use of Latin words make this probable—then much of the difference of treatment would be accounted for. The intercourse of St. Mark with St. Paul, for whom, it is plain, he had a deep regard, would tend in the same way. Under these conditions it would be no violent supposition that two Gospels written in the same year, the one at Rome for Gentiles, by one who had followed the footsteps of the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the other in Palestine, for Jews, by a Jewish Apostle, might exhibit even greater marks of difference than the two Gospels before us. Still it is upon the whole probable that the Gospel of Mark is somewhat later than that of St. Matthew; and the coincidences of language and of matter are so minute and striking that probably no theory of oral tradition will account for them: and thus we are drawn to consider that St. Mark had access to the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew, and made use of it. The great difficulty in such a theory is the omission of some of the discourses which form so large a portion of St. Matthew, and the selection of parts only of others, as for example, of the great eschatologieal discourse. But, once more, the dominant purpose of the Gospel was to inspire admiration for the wonder-working Lord; and the omission of some things that might seem to retard the rapid march of the narration of the wonderful acts of His life, may be thus accounted for. A few of the passages that are thought to bear upon this question of the influence of St. Matthew's Gospel on that of St. Mark are here given. They will indicate the difficulty of the subject.

Mark i. 2, 3. "As it is written in [Isaiah the prophet] Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

Here the quotation from Isaiah xl. 3 is given, word for word, as in St. Matthew iii. 3; whereas the Hebrew and the Septuagint give for "his" the important words "for our God." It is clear then that the two Evangelists are in some way connected, for they agree together, and differ somewhat from both sources. But St. Mark interposes a passage from Malachi iii. 1: "Behold, I send . . . . thy way before thee." The English Version, following the Textus Receptus, reads "in the Prophets," which is discussed below, p. 210. If, as most editors suppose, the true reading is, "in Isaiah the Prophet," the explanation would seem to be that Mark, with the passage of Matthew before him, interposed a quotation of the same purport, but did not alter the formula of quotation, so that both passages appear to be given to Isaiah. The passage from Malachi was meant by St. Mark to be a gloss or note upon the closely parallel passage of Isaiah: "I send my messenger," interprets and limits to a person, the more indefinite, "the voice of one crying," &c.: but as the words of Isaiah are intended to be the emphatic part of his quotation, he puts them last. (Klostermann.)

Mark ii. 10, 11 ". . . . He saith to the sick of the palsy, I say unto thee, arise," &c. In the parallel, Matt. ix. 6, the phrase, "I say unto thee" is wanting, and the introduction of it without, at the same time, taking out the words, "He saith to the sick of the palsy," leaves a tautology, from which the narrative of St. Matthew is free. Here the probability is that St. Mark has transcribed and slightly amplified.

Mark ix. 2–6. "And after six days Jesus taketh with him, Peter and James, and John, and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart *by themselves:* and

He was transfigured before them. And His raiment became shining, *exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them.* And there appeared unto them Elias with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus. And Peter answered and said to Jesus, *Master*, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. *For he wist not what to say; for they were sore afraid.*"

In the whole passage, except the words here marked with Italics, there is the closest similarity of expression to St. Matthew (xvii. 1–4): but there is an omission of the words "His face did shine as the sun" (Matt. xvii. 2). The additions are the word "alone" (E. V. "by themselves"), the "shining," and the allusion to the fuller, where two words occur that are found nowhere else in the New Testament, and one which occurs but once.[1] Then there is the remark on Peter's words, "For he wist not what to say; for they were sore afraid." The words of Peter do not at first appear to need this apology; they were not wholly unnatural. The peace that he found there he wished to retain. That they were "sore afraid" of the glory of their Master's appearance is not perhaps intended: rather, with Volkmar, we may refer the words to the condition of the disciples' minds for the last six days, ever since the announcement of the Passion. It is absolutely certain that the two passages must have some common origin: and perhaps the more probable account is that Mark, with the Gospel of St. Matthew before him, and another source of information also, made the additions. That other source of information may well have been the preaching of Peter: "We were alone—not even another disciple with us. His garb was white and glittering; but with a whiteness that no earthly garment could shew. We were amazed and terrified, and the words that I spoke were hasty and rash." It is safest not to go beyond the assertion that there is a higher probability that the words were added by Mark from Peter's preaching, than that they were present to St. Matthew, and by him were designedly struck out. Such is the kind of difficult and delicate evidence upon which this question turns. It is discussed at great length by Weiss, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Volkmar, Klostermann, and many others, and with varying results.

Dismissing as untenable the supposition that Mark acted as the amanuensis of Peter, we may well seek for traces of the influence of Peter upon this Gospel. If Mark was the interpreter of Peter in his preaching, he would treasure up its leading features, and try to reproduce them. Now, whatever be the source of it, there is a certain vividness, a power of describing for the eye, pervading it all. This is even more manifest in single words interjected, than in longer passages. Jesus "looked round about upon them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts." (iii. 5, comp. v. 34): He "took the child in His arms" (ix. 36, x. 16); He "sat down" (ix. 35); even words that describe inward feeling are intended to convey an idea of the outward expression of the feeling, as when He is "moved with compassion" (i. 41). The inclination to minute description (i. 35–37; vi. 33; vii. 31–37; ix. 3); the change from the aorist to the direct present, as in i. 12, 21:[1] the use of "straightway"[2] more than forty times; the very frequent use of diminutives for child, damsel, daughter, fish, dog, and ear, which gives a popular character to the style; the fulness and circumstantial treatment of the narrative, of which the transaction between Herod and Herodias' daughter is a forcible example (vi. 22–25); all these are characteristic of the second Gospel. We are not warranted in connecting all these features with St. Peter; but there

[1] Στίλβοντα, γναφεύς, here only; λευκᾶναι, here and in Rev. vii. 14. The words "as snow" (ὡς χιών) are doubtful. They are omitted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Buttmann, and Hort; retained by Meyer. Of uncial MSS the Sinaitic, the Vatican, the Codex Ephr. omit: whilst the Alexandrine and the Codex Bezæ contain.

[1] Sometimes the present and aorist are combined in the same verse; Mark vi. 1, ix. 2, xi. 15.

[2] εὐθέως, or εὐθύς, only fifteen times in St. Matthew, and eight in St. Luke.

are some other passages, not the less cogent because they are not so obvious, which are best explained on the supposition that Peter had something to do with them. In i. 36 (which has already been mentioned), "Simon and they that were with him followed after Him;" and it may be asked why Simon alone is mentioned, and the other disciples are thrown together in a nameless group, even the verb "followed" being in the singular number: to which the answer may be that very likely this is the record of a remark of Peter, "I followed after Him with the rest." Another passage of this kind, only more striking, is, "And Simon he surnamed Peter" (iii. 16) in the list of the apostles. The Evangelist does not say, "He called Simon, whom he surnamed Peter:" the calling of Simon is actually not mentioned. But if this, too, is a reproduction of a direct remark, in the first person, then the awkward construction is explained. "He ordained *us* twelve that *we* should be with Him .... and me he surnamed Peter."[1] The same account may be given of the words, "Peter calling to remembrance saith unto Him, Master, behold the fig-tree which thou cursedst is withered away" (xi. 21), it is not natural to say of another that he called to remembrance, for that would be implied in the remark which he made in consequence, but it is very natural to say, "Then *it* came into my mind, that the tree had been cursed," &c. The same applies to the verse on St. Peter in this account of the Transfiguration, already mentioned. We dare not speak with certainty, but the more this peculiar character of the Gospel is considered, its vivid, minute, graphic, popular descriptions, the more we shall be inclined to account for it in the simplest manner, namely, that the old tradition is true, and that Mark was not only the interpreter of Peter, but a diligent hearer and preserver of his preaching; so that this Gospel not only contains the work of Christ, His power and might and wonders, but also in the background a picture of His favoured messenger. On this rock the Church was to be built, and we see what manner of stones, and what plan of building were employed.

[1] Klostermann.

## The Gospel according to St. Luke.

§ 41. *The Man.*—Universal tradition assigns the third Gospel to Luke as its author, and even M. Renan admits that there is no grave reason to question the truth of this.[1] The name Lucas (Luke) is an abbreviated form of Lucanus or Lucilius; it is not to be confounded with Lucius (Acts xiii. 1; Rom. xvi. 21), nor can it be derived from that. The name occurs three times in the New Testament; all three probably refer to the Evangelist (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Philem. v. 24). To the Colossians he is described as "the beloved physician," having been known to them in that faculty. Timothy does not need this mark of identification: to him the words are "only Luke is with me." To Philemon Luke sends his salutation, in common with other "fellow-labourers" of St. Paul. As the Evangelist is evidently the author of the Acts of the Apostles also, we should expect to find some explanations in that book of the connexion between St. Paul and the writer. The name of St. Luke does not occur in the Acts, but probably under the pronoun "we" there are many references to him.

Combining the witness of tradition with that of Holy Scripture, the uncertain with the certain, we are able to trace the outline of this disciple's life. He was born at Antioch in Syria,[2] in what condition of life is uncertain. That he was trained to be a "physician" does not prove that he was of higher birth or station than the rest of the disciples. The well-known tradition that Luke was also a painter, and of no mean skill, who painted portraits of the Lord, of Mary, and of the chief Apostles, rests on the statements of Nicephorus;[3] of the Menology of the Emperor Basil, drawn up in 980, and of other late writers: but none of them are

[1] Évangiles, p. 252.
[2] Eusebius, E. H. iii. 4.
[3] Nicephorus, ii. 43.

of historical authority, and the Acts and Epistles are wholly silent upon a point so likely to be mentioned. "Perhaps it arose from confounding some later Christian painter who bore the name of Luke, and who made pictures of Christ or of Mary, with the Evangelist."[1] He was not born a Jew, for he was not reckoned by St. Paul among them "of the circumcision" (Col. iv. 11, 14); but the tradition is probable, that before his conversion to Christianity, he had adopted Judaism as a "proselyte of the Gate;" who would join in Jewish worship and recognise the Jewish law, but would not be circumcised.[2]

The date of his conversion is uncertain. He was not indeed "an eye-witness and minister of the word from the beginning" (Luke i. 2), or he would have rested his claim as an Evangelist on that strong ground. Still he may have been converted by the Lord Himself, some time before His departure; and the statement of Epiphanius[3] and others, that he was one of the seventy disciples, has nothing very improbable in it. Theophylact[4] mentions this opinion that he was one of the two disciples who journeyed to Emmaus and met Jesus by the way. Tertullian appears to assume that the conversion of Luke is to be ascribed to St. Paul.[5]

§ 42. *Journey of St. Luke with St. Paul.*—The first ray of historical light falls on the Evangelist when he joins St. Paul at Troas, and shares his journey into Macedonia. The sudden transition to the first person plural in Acts xvi. 9 is most naturally explained, after all the objections that have been urged, by supposing that Luke formed one of St. Paul's company from this point. Against any other hypothesis the objections are manifold. It is said that the "we" might mark the place where Timothy comes in, and that we have from this point a memoir or narrative from the pen of Timothy; but there is no sort of break or change in the style, at the point where this incorporation begins, and if the Evangelist could re-cast and assimilate this style, why should this pronoun alone be left outstanding? Still more cogent is the remark that the "we" does not begin when Timothy first appears, and that he continues with Paul after the "we" has ceased to be used. The same remark applies to Silas. The conversion of St. Luke must have taken place before, and he had probably known Paul and his work, since he silently, and with this abrupt and unexplained change of person, takes his place among the great Apostle's followers without a hint that this is his first admission to the knowledge and ministry of Christ. He may have found his way to Troas to preach the Gospel, sent possibly by St. Paul himself. As far as Philippi the Evangelist journeyed with the Apostle; and then (xvii. 1) the third person is renewed. St. Luke was left behind. During the rest of the second missionary journey we hear of him no more; but in the third journey the same indication reminds us that Luke is again of the company, having apparently joined it at Philippi, where he had been left (xx. 5). With the Apostle he passed through Miletus, Tyre, and Cæsarea to Jerusalem (xx. 5, xxi. 18). Between the two visits of Paul to Philippi seven years had elapsed (A.D. 51–A.D. 58), which the Evangelist may have spent in Philippi and its neighbourhood, preaching the Gospel.

In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians we read (viii. 18) "We have sent with him" (*i.e.* with Titus) "the brother, whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the Churches." The subscription of the Epistle sets out that it was "written from Philippi, a city of Macedonia, by Titus and Lucas." It would seem then that during the "three months" of Paul's sojourn at Philippi (Acts xx. 3) Luke was sent from that place to Corinth on this errand; and

[1] Bleek, 'Einleitung.'

[2] Isidor. Hisp. 'De vita et obitu sanctorum, ch. lxxxii. "Lucas . . . . natione Syrus, arte medicus, Græco eloquio eruditus, quem plerique tradunt proselytum fuisse, et Hebræas literas ignorasse."

[3] Cont. Hær. li. 11. [4] On Luke xxiv.

[5] Adv. Marcion. iv. 2. "Lucas, non apostolus sed apostolicus; non magister, sed discipulus, utique magister minor, certe tanto posterior quanto posterioris Apostoli sectator, Pauli sine dubio."

the words "whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the Churches" enable us to estimate his activity during the interval in which he has not been mentioned. It is somewhat of a lesson to all critics and students of the Bible; between these two points, at neither of which does the name of Luke occur, is latent a seven years' career of glorious missionary work, and the workman does not so much as mention his own name by way of vindicating his claim to that "praise in the Gospel" to which all the Churches witnessed.[1]

He again appears, in the company of Paul, in the memorable journey to Rome (Acts xxvii. 1); he remained at his side during his first imprisonment (Col. iv. 14; Philemon 24), and if it is to be supposed that the Second Epistle to Timothy was written during the second imprisonment, then the testimony of that Epistle (iv. 11) shews that he continued faithful to the Apostle to the end of his afflictions.

After St. Paul's death the acts of his beloved companion are hopelessly obscure to us. In the well-known passage of Epiphanius[2] we read that he preached in Dalmatia, Gallia, Italy, and Macedonia; but the author reads "crescens *in Gallia*" for *in Galatia*, in 2 Tim. iv. 10. Eusebius is silent, and the later writers have nothing to tell that need be recorded. It is Gregory Nazianzen who first ranks Luke amongst the martyrs.[3] Nicephorus records that whilst ministering in Greece he was hanged upon an olive-tree.[4] That he died a martyr between the years 75 and 100 would seem to have the balance of suffrages in its favour, and such an end to an active Christian career was the most likely in itself. It is sufficient for this examination of St. Luke's Gospel to bear in mind that the writer was the tried and constant friend of the Apostle Paul.

[1] The praise lay in the activity with which he *preached* the Gospel, and not, as Jerome supposes, in his being the author of a written Gospel! De Viris Ill. ch. 7.

[2] Cont. Hær. li. 11, vol. ii. 464, ed. Dindorf.

[3] Orat. iii. adv. Julianum.

[4] E. H. ii. 43.

§ 43. *The Introduction to the Gospel.*—The Gospel according to St. Luke commences with a kind of epistolary address or dedication, a form unusual in Jewish writings, but comparable with the dedication by Josephus to Epaphroditus.[1] In this preface the scope of the work is indicated:—

"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, Even as they delivered them to us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word; It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed."

From this we learn that there were already in existence a number of attempts to write the Gospel history; and it is at least hinted that, on the whole, the attempts had not been conclusively successful. The materials were abundant, and St. Luke does not give us to understand that he will not employ them; on the contrary, he puts himself on a level with those inquirers by the words "to me too," as to his general purpose, and will inquire into the traditions which have come from the apostolic eyewitnesses, and his inquiries will doubtless embrace those former records. This is the first indication of written materials for the Gospel; and though no sound argument of the chronology can be founded on this alone, it is clear that the third stage of development has been reached. First came the eyewitnesses, delivering in their preaching the tidings of the facts they had witnessed; then came a variety of efforts, and these more or less incomplete from the greatness of the task; and, thirdly, came the present stage, of writing a regular and orderly history, in which use should be made of all the materials at command. Against that natural shock to the feelings that attends the first attempts to analyse the growth of those Gospels, which one has

[1] Renan, Évangiles, 255.

never before, perhaps, contemplated except as beautiful and complete wholes, one may set the fact that one of the Evangelists has himself called our attention to his method and to the materials which he had before him. Nor does he make any claim higher than this: that he had followed with careful attention, from first to last, what the holy Apostles had told.

Who were the "many"? The expression could not apply to Matthew and Mark; two are not "many," and their labours would have been mentioned in a different way. It points rather to a multitude of attempts, most of them probably partial, to rescue from the treacherous custody of memory and to fix in a permanent form the things which the writers had heard in preaching. Some of the apocryphal Gospels may have been of this number, notably that Gospel of the Hebrews, so much discussed; but the greater part have passed away. More than one have contributed something to the Gospel before us, and probably that large section, peculiar to St. Luke, commencing with Luke ix. 51, and ending with xviii. 14, was in substance one of these documents, some faithful inquirer having chosen for his special subject one particular journey and all that took place in it.

§ 44. *Date of Gospel.*—When was the third Gospel written? At first sight the concluding passage in the Acts seems to prescribe a limit of time, later than which the date of the Gospel cannot be. "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came to him" (Acts xxviii. 30). It is argued that if the later events of St. Paul's career had then transpired, the Evangelist who had been relating, with remarkable fulness, the preceding events would have continued to treat the following incidents in the same manner. This would give for the Acts the date of about A.D. 64, *i.e.* about the end of the second year of St. Paul's imprisonment; and that of the Gospel might perhaps be placed about A.D. 62. This, however, cannot be sustained. It would place St. Luke earlier than the rest, whereas there is reason to believe that, as St. Mark made use of St. Matthew, so did St. Luke of St. Mark; and if the date of the first Gospel be about 65, the third must be separated from it by a considerable interval. There is, besides, some reason to think that as the first Gospel was written on the eve of the destruction of Jerusalem, so the third was written after that event had been consummated. The writer seems to recall words of our Lord about this event, by the light of their literal fulfilment; the trench is cast about the beleaguered city: the armies that encompass it shall enter in; there shall be terror and flight; great distress and wrath; the people slain or captured, to be made slaves in foreign lands; and Jerusalem trodden down by the Gentiles.[1] All this is very vivid; nothing is added to the words of Jesus, but His words are recalled and selected by the light of a fearful history. Besides, it is only in St. Luke that we learn anything of the copious literature that had already begun to accumulate; and this would require time, and certainly one would not expect to find in the earliest of these books an intimation of this kind, more suitable to the later. All these considerations point to a later date, to some point perhaps between 75 and 80 as the approximate date.

For the abrupt termination of the Book of the Acts some other cause than a chronological one would have to be found. It is no doubt difficult to explain; but on the other hypothesis as to the date, the silence of the writer, as to many things that he must have known concerning the Lord, is not easier to understand.[2]

§ 45. *The Place.*—The places in which the Gospel was written may well have been "Achaia and Bœotia," according to Jerome's tradition.[3] What is clearest is that the writer was far removed from Judæa, nor are the Jewish laws, customs, or places known to him in the same way as to St. Matthew. Keim leans to

[1] Luke xix. 43-44; xxi. 20-24.

[2] Euseb. H. E. vi. 14. Godet is inclined to give weight to the tradition preserved by Clement of Alexandria, that the Gospels containing the genealogies (Matthew and Luke) were composed before the others.

[3] De Vir. Ill. 7.

a Roman origin, on account of the connexion with the Acts of the Apostles and with St. Mark's Gospel.

§ 46. *Schleiermacher's View.*—The supposition that the third Gospel is chiefly a compilation of fragmentary documents which the writer found already in existence, is thus stated by Schleiermacher:[1] "When I review the investigation which has thus been carried on step by step, and sum up the whole, it seems to me that though several of the details may be more or less liable to objection, still the main position is firmly established, that Luke, in this part of his work, is neither an independent writer, nor has made a compilation from works which extended over the whole course of the life of Jesus. For we meet with too many isolated pieces which have no relation to the rest, and the character of the several parts is too different, to admit of either supposition. He is from beginning to end no more than the compiler and arranger of documents which he found in existence, and which he allows to pass unaltered through his hands. His merit in this capacity is twofold: first, that of the arrangement; this, however, is the slighter of the two. For as he found much already connected, not only is the correctness of his arrangement dependent on his predecessors, and much may be assigned to a wrong place without fault of his, but also the arrangement was by this rendered much easier than if he had found all the parts separate. But the far greater merit is this, that he has admitted scarcely any pieces but what are peculiarly genuine and good; for this was certainly not the effect of accident, but the fruit of a judiciously-instituted investigation and a well-weighed choice." Notwithstanding this faint praise, the place here assigned to the Evangelist is such as to leave us without any reasonable account of the reverence in which this work has been held since the middle of the second century. A mere compiler could not have attained to such consideration. The Evangelist says in his preface, that he intends to have in view, and not to put wholly on one side, the traditions and the literature that existed already. That he had access to some sources of information which neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark had used, is probable; it may even be conceded that passages may have been adopted, as they were found in the documents employed. But as a complete account of the Gospel, this hypothesis is quite inadmissible. It might more plausibly be argued, as Keim has done, that its chief source was a complete Gospel of an Ebionite type, than that he had used mere fragmentary materials. The peculiar emphasis on the danger of riches and the advantage of poverty recurs again and again throughout: God favours the lowly and poor, and repels the mighty and the wealthy (i. 52, 53; ii. 7, 24; vi. 20); wealth is a snare (xi. 41; xii. 33, 15, 20); the parable of the unjust steward and of the rich man and Lazarus (xvi.); all these are of one tendency and bearing. The Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark were probably known to St. Luke; the agreements in word and arrangement are too strong to allow this possibility to be excluded. In the long section of the Gospel which has no parallel passages in the two former Gospels, it would seem that St. Luke has had access to some old and authentic source, the language of which, however, he has treated as an independent writer would do in fusing together the materials at his command.

§ 47. *Marcion.*—A question of great importance is, What is the relation of the Gospel of St. Luke to the Gospel used by Marcion? Marcion of Sinope, who flourished before the middle of the second century, framed a scheme of Christianity of his own: he adopted with all his heart the ideas of redemption and forgiveness by the Gospel; and the attacks on his sincerity are to be regarded as belonging to the rhetoric of controversy, and are to be received with the greatest caution. But his system was one of dualism. The Old Testament he regards, not as a preparation for the Gospel, and a schoolmaster to train the world for Christ, but as something unlike in spirit to the Gospel. The God of the Old Testament he

[1] Essay on St. Luke. Bp. Thirlwall's Translation, p. 313.

regarded as a being cruel and jealous. The heretic Cerdo had already taught that the just and severe God of the Law and the Prophets was not the same as the merciful Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Marcion carried this further still, and blasphemously argued that the God of the Old Testament was represented as doing evil, and as delighting in strife, as repenting of His decrees, and inconsistent with Himself.[1] In Marcion's strange system the God of the Old Testament was a lower being, a Demiurgus, engaged in a continual conflict with matter, over which he was not able to gain a complete victory. But the holy and eternal God, perfect in goodness and love, does not come in contact with matter, and creates only what is like to and cognate with Himself. In the Old Testament we see the Demiurgus; in the scheme of redemption in the New Testament we see the working of the one true God.

That not one of our existing Gospels would fit such a system as this is quite obvious, for in each of them, more or less, the Old Testament is recognised as the soil and germ of the New. Marcion regarded Paul as the only Apostle who had remained faithful to his calling. He admitted into his canon of Scripture the Pauline Epistles, and a Gospel which he regarded as Pauline; and he rejected the rest of the New Testament, not from any idea that the works were not genuine, but because he considered them as the genuine productions of men who were not faithful expositors of the Gospel which they had received.

§ 48. *Marcion's Gospel.*—What was the Gospel that Marcion used? The ancient testimony on this point is strong and clear. He took the Gospel of Luke and altered it to suit his peculiar system.[2] This view was maintained without question throughout the Church until Semler threw out a doubt, the prolific seed of a long controversy. He thought that instead of being an abridgment of St. Luke, the Gospel of Marcion was drawn from the same source as St. Luke, each being in fact a re-editing of some one common original document.

[1] See Irenæus, I. xxvii. 1 and 2, p. 256. Stieren.

[2] Irenæus, I. xxvii. 2; Tertullian cont. Marc. iv. 2; Origen, cont. Cels. ii. 27; Epiphanius, Hær. xlii. 11; Theodoret, Hæret. Fab. i. 24; Marcion, however, did not call his Gospel after Luke's name, but only the Gospel of Christ.

We do not follow this controversy here:[1] the conclusive reasoning of Volkmar has re-established the account given by the Fathers. Marcion has used, and has altered for his purpose, the Gospel of St. Luke. "The old opinion," says Dr. Davidson, "will not be seriously disturbed again, as long as the treatise of Volkmar exists."[2]

[1] See Bible Dictionary. St. Luke.

[2] Introduction, p. 51. Dr. Davidson did not know how powerless the logic of Volkmar would be against the indurated integument of the "unprejudiced person," that ideal creation of the author of 'Supernatural Religion.' After very frequent reference to Volkmar, the author of that work concludes "If we except the Gospel according to the Hebrews, however, Marcion's Gospel is the oldest Evangelical work of which we hear anything, and it ranks far above our third Synoptic [Luke] in this respect. There is no evidence that it was not one of the numerous Gospels in circulation before our third Synoptic was written, and out of which that Gospel itself grew." Vol. ii. p. 139. The former of these statements, that Marcion's Gospel is *the oldest Evangelical work* of which we have anything, is supported by several references to Volkmar, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, &c. On turning to the first reference to Volkmar, it proves that he says nothing of this kind; but that *the testimony* to the existence of Marcion's Gospel is older than that to the existence of our Gospels, because Marcion's Gospel is *proved* to exist before 130, whilst the clear testimony for the other dates about the middle of the century. Volkmar's whole contention is that St. Luke is older than Marcion's Gospel, the latter being taken from the former; and here he is quoted as the authority for Marcion's being "the oldest Evangelical work." Volkmar, Ev. Marcion's, p. 1. Another reference is equally astonishing (to p. 257 of Volkmar) where a remark of Volkmar to the effect that we are indebted in a few places to Marcion for preserving the oldest text of St. Luke, is used as an authority for asserting that Marcion's was "the oldest Evangelical work," and, therefore, quite incapable of giving us the best readings of a Gospel of Luke that did not exist. Hilgenfeld, in the place quoted, comes to the result "that it is true that Marcion knew and re-edited the Gospel of Luke, but that the latter, in its present condition, has also passed through a revision, though a slight one" (Evang. Justin's, p. 474. Holtzmann (p. 402) is quoted also; he says, "In any case Marcion offers the oldest testimony for Luke." That is to say, he affirms exactly the opposite of what he is quoted to support;

Holtzmann, too, considers the priority of St. Luke to Marcion a settled question. Indeed, if after all the discussion any unprejudiced person was still at liberty to treat the whole question as open, this would be a complete *reductio ad absurdum* for critical science. The result is very important. Marcion, writing about A.D. 130, needs a history of Jesus for his basis, and he finds our Gospel of St. Luke already in existence, and adapts it to his purpose. Thus the earliest complete witness to any Gospel in an ancient writer attaches to that which is probably third in order of time. If that be so, the Gospel of Marcion is a complete barrier to those who would place all three Gospels later than the middle of the second century, since that one which appears to be the latest was established already in the beginning of it.[1]

§ 49. *St. Luke and St. Paul.*—The old tradition that St. Luke wrote his Gospel under the direct influence of St. Paul, comes to us on the authority of Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius. The two first assert that we have in St. Luke the Gospel preached by Paul.[1] Origen calls it "the Gospel quoted by Paul," alluding to Romans ii. 16.[2] Eusebius refers St. Paul's words "according to my Gospel" (2 Tim. ii. 8) to that of St. Luke,[3] in which Jerome concurs.[4] The preface to the Gospel is quite inconsistent with the notion that the Gospel was compiled under the directions, or even the influence, of any one man. The claim made by the Evangelist to an independent historical position is too definite. Yet, if we compare St. Paul's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 23-25) with that of St. Luke (xxii. 19, 20), we shall not think the verbal coincidences accidental. A less obvious parallel between 1 Cor. xv. 3, and Luke xxiv. 26, 27, which lies more in thought than in expression, tends the same way: but is much less conclusive. The coincidence in the two accounts of the Last Supper is not so much a sign of connexion with St. Paul as of the antiquity of St. Luke's account. The date of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians is about A.D. 57, and here is an accidental proof that a Gospel, perhaps composed much later, has preserved the very words of the old account. There is, however, a deep affinity between this Gospel and the preaching of St. Paul, which is of more importance for this question. This is the Gospel from which shines most brightly the light of redemption, forgiveness, restoration, for all the human race. The two earlier Gospels are illuminated with the same light, for it is the light of the Spirit of Christ: but if differences are to be noticed at all, this is one of the most distinctly marked. The parables of the prodigal son, of the good Samaritan, of the lost piece of money, are all peculiar to St. Luke, and they furnish the preacher with some of his most

for he says that Luke is older than Marcion, so the latter cannot be the oldest. The difference is great, one would think, between the oldest testimony to a work not the oldest, and "the oldest Evangelical work." The reference to Westcott is equally delusive: this and one to Schwegler, which cannot at this moment be verified, make up the list. We do not charge the writer with intentional perversion; but the last paragraph of his account of Marcion shews the motive of the whole, which has prevented him from a fair survey of the evidence. "At the very best, even if the hypothesis that Marcion's Gospel was a mutilated Luke were established, Marcion affords no evidence in favour of the authenticity or trustworthy character of our third Synoptic." To that conclusion we should have come at last, we suspect, had twenty Volkmars barred the way.

[1] The author of 'Supernatural Religion' makes much of the fact that there are some discrepancies of readings between Marcion and the Gospel as we have it. Volkmar finds this to be the case in about six places; namely, x. 21, 22; xi. 2; xii. 38; xvii. 2; xviii. 19. Of four other places he speaks more doubtfully; these are vi. 17; xii. 32; xvii. 12; xxiii. 2. So that in ten verses at most Marcion has different readings from those of the accessible MSS of St. Luke; in other words, in these few verses we are able to look over Marcion's shoulder at the MS that he was using. This is not wonderful. If these deviations make the Gospel of Luke another Gospel, then we must have as many Lukes as there are MSS; for between MSS the discrepancies are more numerous.

[1] Iren. cont. Hær. iii. 1; Tert. cont. Marc. iv. 5.

[2] Eusebius, E. H. vi. 25.

[3] E. H. iii. 4.

[4] De Vir. Ill. 7.

moving arguments for repentance. The parable of the lost sheep is common to St. Matthew and St. Luke; but the difference of treatment is considerable; and probably the two accounts relate to distinct occasions.[1] In St. Matthew the finder "rejoiceth more of that sheep than of the ninety and nine which went not astray," and the Lord adds, "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish:" in St. Luke, "he calleth his friends and neighbours together, saying unto them, Rejoice with me, for I have found the sheep which was lost," and adds that "joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." The conversion of the thief on the cross, the prayer of Jesus for His murderers, the relations of the Lord with the Samaritans,[2] and the account of the good Samaritan, perhaps a parable with an historical ground, and of the Samaritan leper,[3] the account of a journey in Samaria, all lead the minds of his readers to understand the infinite love and pity of Jesus which led Him to seek and save in every region and class. Before this love all questions of class break down. The door of redemption is opened wide: the Pharisee fails of forgiveness, and the penitent publican secures it. The Priest and Levite pass on the other side, but the good Samaritan tends the wounded man. Simon the Pharisee, the host of Jesus, learns a new lesson from our Lord when the sinful woman is allowed to draw near and to wash the feet of Jesus.[4] All this points to a breaking down of all legal privileges and distinctions of class, and to the admission of all sinners alike to the mercy of the Lord upon their repentance. God "hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted them of low degree."[5] The genealogy of Jesus in Luke reaches back to Adam; so that he is placed in relation to the whole human race. The evils that should befall the Jewish nation are the consequence of their rejection of Christ.[6] In all these points there is a certain correspondence between the Gospel teaching of St. Paul, which might be expressed by saying that had St. Paul been disposed to select one Gospel out of the rest upon which to found his teaching, he would have found St. Luke somewhat more suitable to his purpose. But this must not be pushed too far. Even those who call this a Pauline Gospel have sought to account for its impartial tone by the assumption that it is composed from various documents, Ebionite and Samaritan. Critics like Ritschl, Zeller, and Schwegler have come to the result that there are two lines of direction to be traced in this Gospel, the one that of Jewish Christian thought, and the other of Pauline, which the Evangelist harmonises and conciliates. If so, the "polemical" tendency so often insisted on must indeed be weak!

§ 50. *Comparison of Diction.*—A comparison of the diction of St. Luke with that of the Pauline Epistles shews an amount of agreement such as would of itself prove that some relation had existed between the two suspected writers. Holtzmann has elaborated this comparison with great care,[1] if at times he uses too much refinement. But the inferences from this resemblance must be cautiously drawn. It does not prove that St. Luke copied from St. Paul, any more than it indicates the converse process. For example, the account of the Last Supper is common to the two writers, and the Epistle in which it finds place was written before the Gospel—at least the Gospel as a whole; but whether St. Paul found St. Luke already in possession of this account from some older source, and accepted and used it, or St. Luke shaped the words of his narrative into a certain conformity with the passage of St. Paul cannot be resolved by internal evidence, though the former theory may seem more probable. So far as St. Paul and St. Luke were friends and loving fellow-workers in the same great task, each would help and influence the other.

[1] Matt. xxiii. 12-14; Luke xv. 3-7; also ch. xv. and xvi.
[2] Luke ix. 51-56.
[3] Luke x. 33, xvii. 16.
[4] Luke vii. 36-50.
[5] Luke i. 52.
[6] xix. 44, xxi. 24, xxiii. 27.

[1] Dr. Davidson, in his Introduction, adopts Holtzmann's laborious analysis without any specific acknowledgment.

Words that were used only by these two, or almost exclusively by them, of which the number is very great, indicate much foregoing intercourse between the two writers, rather than a studious following of the writings of one by the other. The resemblances being admitted, and the fact that the Apostle and the Evangelist were friends being also admitted, we are not in a position to pursue the subject to the length of shewing in each case of resemblance which was the original and which the follower. It is confessed on all hands that the Evangelist has not confined his Gospel to the Apostle's teaching, as a mere disciple would have done; to take a single example, the sending of the seventy is generally regarded as one of the indications of the universalist spirit of the third Gospel, for the number seventy was typical of the Gentiles, as the number twelve of the tribes of the chosen people; but those who talk of a wish to depreciate the labours of the twelve Apostles in the interest of St. Paul, must shut their eyes to the passages like Luke ix. 10, omitted in St. Matthew, in which the success of the twelve is made prominent. Any fair judge will agree with Zeller,[1] that the notion of a hostility of St. Luke against the original Apostles is refuted by the two facts that he introduces matter that might seem to do them honour, where St. Matthew has omitted it, and that he has let fall out of his narrative things that might seem to place them in an unfavourable light.

§ 51. *Contents of St. Luke's Gospel.*—The contents of St. Luke's Gospel may be briefly indicated. Fulfilling the promise of the Prologue to this Gospel,[2] this Evangelist proceeds to give an account of all that relates to Jesus of Nazareth from first to last, and in a certain order. Accordingly he goes back to the first word of the tidings of salvation—to the conception and birth of Christ, and even of John the Baptist, and connects the birth of the Lord with the history of the world (i. 5; ii. 1; iii. 1), thus implying that events which concerned all mankind were about to be transacted.[1] As St. Matthew had traced the genealogy of the Lord from Abraham, in order to connect the Messiah of the Jews with the chosen people; St. Luke, in order to connect the Saviour of the world with the whole of the saved race, traces the descent up to Adam "the son of God." With ch. iii. commences a group of events and discourses in Galilee, and chiefly in Capernaum, which are common to the three Evangelists, and which in St. Luke are apparently arranged in order of time. This section ends with ch. ix. 50. The next section, ix. 51 to xviii. 14, contains many events and discourses peculiar to St. Luke.[2] Some have thought that this section is all to be taken as the record of a particular journey to Jerusalem, with the mention of which it commences. This, however, is untenable; the transitions of place are against it. The Lord is in Bethany, x. 38; then in some other part, journeying towards Jerusalem, xiii. 22; then back in Galilee, xiii. 31; then in Samaria and Galilee, journeying, xvii. 11; again, on a journey to Jerusalem, xviii. 31, whilst in verse 35 of the same chapter He is again in the neighbourhood of Bethany, and not on the straight road to Jerusalem, but "nigh unto Jericho." Attempts are made to explain these transitions, consistently with the historical order; but a more natural and consistent explanation is that the chronological order is here put aside, to make way for the topical order. As in St. Matthew, in the Sermon on the Mount, the actual order of the history gives way to the Evangelist's purpose of placing before the hearers the teaching of Jesus as one whole; so here some words of reproof, as to a cure wrought on the Sabbath day, introduce a large group of parables, ch. xv. . . . . the general drift of which is that a feeling of want and misery is requisite to salvation through Christ, and that salvation requires also decision and a purpose and a choice. It may be that these teachings are massed into one place on

[1] Apostelgesch. p. 450.
[2] See notes thereon.

[1] Keil, Matthäus, p. 6.
[2] Compare note at the end of chap. ix.

account of their having been preserved in one written document; but on this it would be difficult to pronounce. With the last section, that of the Passion, St. Luke again takes his place among the synoptic Gospels, not however without passages that shew him as an independent witness.

§ 52. *Summary.*—It is time now to consider the relative weight of the several factors, in the important problem of the origin of the Gospels.

1. There probably were in existence at the time of the composition of the three Gospels, many documents, some of more and some of less authority and extent, in which the sayings and acts of Jesus were recorded. Indeed, St. Luke almost says this in his preface. The two genealogies were probably of this kind; and the discourses in St. Luke may also have come from a distinct account, of which St. Luke alone of the three had knowledge. There may well have been many others, nor is there any reason to think, after the words of St. Luke, that such materials would have been passed over by the Evangelists. But the attempts to separate them have all issued in great confusion; at first sight the task of restoring from the common material which all three Gospels contain, a primitive or fundamental Gospel, has appeared so easy as to be a mere mechanical exercise: but on grappling with the labour, its difficulties have proved insurmountable. Since the time of Schleiermacher, the recovery of the original *logia*, the supposed book of discourses of St. Matthew, has been thought a fitting task for critical science; but unfortunately for this attempt, St. Luke, as well as St. Matthew, presents the phenomenon of a mass of discourses, inwoven with the narrative; and a doubt has actually been raised whether the true hiding-place of the *logia* of St. Matthew be not the existing Gospel of St. Luke; a doubt, however, which yields to the stronger doubt, already discussed, whether a separate book of discourses is at all intended in the word *logia*.

We are obliged then, in admitting that there must have been some documents in existence, to confess that they are for us irrecoverable by any process of separation.

2. Equally certain does it appear that oral traditional preaching must have grown up even earlier than the written documents. The companions of the Lord were few in number: the followers whom they attracted afterwards were many. The Apostles must have been called upon from the very day of Pentecost to preach to eager enquirers, daily and hourly, the facts which they had witnessed and the rest had not. The story often told would be told in the same words, and the different teachers would find the advantage of conforming their narrative to one type, as to language and order. The notion of repeating, always in the same words, a story that must be often told, is repugnant to modern tastes; but we are not the best judges in that matter, because we have the benefit of a fixed standard in our printed books, whereas the Jewish expositors of the law aimed at a fixed standard by the very means of constant repetition. The authors of the Mishna, called the Tannaites or repeaters, were those who preserved the lore which was not yet reduced to writing in the Talmud: from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, to the end of the second century, that strange collection subsisted only in the memory of these teachers. The existence of this phenomenon, side by side almost with the formation of the Gospels, throws a light upon the mode of that formation.[1] To the method of instruction by means of fixed forms, the Jews would have no objection on the score of taste, and usage was quite in its favour. On the other hand, as Gieseler argues, the literary activity of the Jews at this time was at its very lowest. The terrible oppression to which they were subject, under the later governors, was too severe to allow them to think of anything but deliverance from their wrongs, and the same cause brought about a decline of

[1] See the historical works of Jost and Grätz; also a paper by A. Réville on the "History of the Jews after the fall of Jerusalem," in 'Revue des deux Mondes,' November, 1867; also Gieseler, 'Entstehung,' p. 53, seq.

the means of culture, whilst Greece and Rome were still alive with literary activity. Thus we must first conceive a state of things in which a book would not be likely to be thought of, and a fixed form of oral tradition would be likely, in order to judge this question. In both respects the condition in which we live is exactly opposite to this. But under those conditions, it was very likely that a fixed body of historical teaching would form itself, would grow day by day more consolidated and more uniform, for the use of an assembly that took an interest in preserving, not only the contents but also the fixed form of the narration. The books would be formed afterwards, and no doubt the near prospect of dispersion and overthrow would quicken the desire for written records, in lieu of the traditions, which required a settled community for their safe custody. The probability then is great that Gieseler's position is so far true, that the Gospel was first fixed in oral teaching before it passed into written books. This oral teaching is the cause of the uniformity of plan and expression, which belongs to a large section of all the three Gospels. But a number of questions spring up which will not readily be resolved. Was there another and separate source for the discourses of the Lord? If so, does St. Matthew or St. Luke come nearest to it? Was there yet another cycle of tradition, to preserve for us the large section of St. Luke, ch. ix. to ch. xviii.? This is another of the mysteries with which the growth of the Gospel is surrounded; and we must know where to stop. But there will be no danger in accepting as the second factor in the calculation, the growth of an oral tradition.

3. The time of the formation of these materials would probably extend from the Day of Pentecost to the year 63. During the next ten or twelve years the three Gospels before us were published. At what time they became known to the whole Church and generally adopted will require a separate inquiry; but the condition of the Church during the first thirty years of its existence will have an important bearing on the question of the formation of the Gospels. M. Renan figures to himself a Church in which historical facts were of small interest, amid a people which never gave itself much trouble about accuracy of fact, but only concerned itself with ideas. No doubt such a frame of mind would have been favourable to the formation of mythical narratives: no doubt, also, the frame of mind has been invented to account for the supposed myths. The preaching of the Apostles was always founded on facts of history—on the facts of the life of Jesus—and never on ideas. There would be temptation enough towards an opposite course. Ebionite views of poverty would be attractive to the Jewish people; political aspirations for the coming of an earthly kingdom would have secured a hearing from every class of Jews; the seeming defeat of Jesus, by His death, would give an inducement to cast into a seemly shade the acts of His career, and to bring into prominence moral teachings so beautiful that, with whatsoever name allied, the world would never suffer them to die. In Corinth or in Rome the preaching of the fact of the Crucifixion was a mere peril and inconvenience: to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness. All this makes more remarkable the tenacity of the first preachers in holding up the cross at all times and to all peoples. There is hardly a discourse which does not at once accept the fact most likely to offend. A crucified Lord, and a Saviour raised from the dead, is the first word and the last. Christianity was bound up with the facts that Jesus Christ died and rose again. If these were not true, the preaching was all vain, and the hopes raised by Christianity were quite delusive.

Of the efficacy of such teaching the Christians had no doubt. A great number of the Jews at Rome had become Christians. Many Gentiles, who had first become Jewish proselytes, had proceeded to embrace the new Gospel. When Claudius banished the Jews, it was because "at the instigation of a certain Chrestus they excited ceaseless disturbances." They are spoken of as if the living Christ was visible among them still,

Much obscurity hangs over the cradle of the infant Church at Rome. Who was its founder? Was it a Gentile community chiefly, or a Jewish? Whence came St. Paul's accurate knowledge, not only of the condition of the Church in general, but of the very persons who were most prominent in it? However these questions are answered, it is sure that the ground on which St. Paul met them in the great Epistle, written to them as early as A.D. 58, was the historical ground of the death and resurrection of Christ.

The person of the Founder was the religion of the Church. The person of the Founder was the source of its power, not merely over those of His nation, but over Greek and Roman too. The Gospels arose out of the yearning of the Christian society to know fully the Master in whose name they were able to conquer principalities and powers, and whose cross was the anchor of hope for a ruined world.

4. Whatever the view that is taken of the common origin of the Gospels, it must include the admission that the works in question are all independent books in respect of the distinct character and purposes of each. The writers are not like modern literary workmen, who from a few books thrown down on their table construct an epitome or an abridgment. (Keil.) The Gospel of St. Matthew has always held the first place, not merely in the list of books, but in the mind of the Church. It was the prominent Gospel in the mind of Justin Martyr; it has been quoted more often than any other ever since. Interposed, as it were, between the Old Testament and the New, published just before the Holy City was destroyed, it revealed the relation of the old to the new. "It was the ultimatum of Jehovah to His ancient people—Believe, or prepare for destruction! Recognise in Jesus your Messiah, or expect Him as your Judge! The book which contains this supreme summons is the close of the Old Testament and the opening of the New. It has the place marked for it in the archives of the kingdom of God upon earth, the Bible, precisely at the point which was assigned to it by the religious sentiment of the Church."[1] To the marked character of the Gospel, writers like Keim and Renan bear witness. Even the opinion that it is a translation from the Hebrew is giving way to the conviction of its originality, although the internal evidence for the latter has to overcome the positive testimony of Papias for the former view. Upon a superficial examination it might seem that at least the Gospel of St. Mark must be excepted from any claim to originality made for the Gospels. It has but a few verses that are wholly new and peculiar to him, but its character is as marked as that of the others. The exact and minute touches of description, which seem to come from an eyewitness, and which Klostermann and others have tried to connect with St. Peter, and as it seems successfully, would alone vindicate for this Gospel an independent place. But there is something deeper. To display the power and might of Christ in healing and in conquering evil is the object of the Evangelist. The miraculous power of the Lord is brought into the front, and for this end the discourses, which the writer must have known, are either pased over, or only introduced where they heighten the main impression of the work. Nowhere else is the conflict with evil spirits so strongly brought out as in St. Mark. The teaching of the Evangelist is, that into the midst of a sick and dying world a new Power had entered for its salvation, and he calls on all to watch the strong mysterious march of this Power and to adore with him. This Power is the Son of God Himself.[2]

The Third Gospel was written, as Holtzmann admits, a few years later than that of St. Matthew; but in some parts it

[1] Godet, 'Études Bibliques,' p. 25.

[2] Grau, 'Schrifthum,' i. 125; Luthardt, 'Evangelien,' p. 15; Keil, Matt. p. 4. The omission of the words "Son of God," "Son of the living God," in Mark viii. 9, (see Matt. xvi. 16,) and the doubtful words "Son of God" in i. 1, which are not found in the Sinaitic Codex, may seem to call this in question; but compare Luke iv. 41, with Mark iii. 11; and Luke viii. 28, with Mark v. 7; also Matt. xxvi. 63, with Mark xiv. 61; and Luke xxiii. 47, with Mark xv. 39.

seems to bear marks of a greater antiquity. The more marked vindication of the rights of the poor against the rich, the so-called Ebionite element of some critics, may possibly be no more than the consequence of an earlier reduction to writing of some parts of the Lord's teaching, in which that which had reference to the existing social condition of the people of Jerusalem, their woes and sufferings, was preserved; whilst later writers, seeing the approaching dissolution of the Jewish polity, were guided to write rather the truths which belonged to the whole world. The superior place that seems to be assigned to poverty as such, in the account of the rich man and Lazarus, may have been, without any of the usual glosses and reserves, true of the Jewish people, in so far as the eye of Jesus saw that among the very poor was the most hearty love of God and the most meek spirit of obedience to a higher law. But a different condition of things might be found elsewhere; for there is no immunity of poverty from great sin, and so the "blessed be ye poor" of Luke is really equivalent to the "blessed are the poor in spirit" of St. Matthew, if indeed "ye poor" are those poor whose spirit is humble like their condition: the godless and murderous communist, poor enough, has no part or lot in those words of Jesus. Akin to this feature is that which is the chief character of the Third Gospel; it is the Gospel of free grace, of equal forgiveness to a whole sinful world. This has contributed to the belief that some connexion between St. Paul and the Evangelist existed; as regards the other Gospels, it is a feature which stamps it with the seal of originality. Of smaller concern to us here is the greater literary skill of style and construction on which Keim, Renan and so many others, have descanted. Enough to remark that whatever has been discovered or surmised, as to the common root of the Gospels, will leave behind, or rather will bring into view, the independence of each work, considered as a whole. The discussions upon the Gospels, so fruitful in details, so disappointing as regards the main problem, have arisen from the endeavour by the help of these factors, to analyse the very source and composition of every part of the works. This will never be. One of the notable features of this problem is that the hypotheses which are used to account for the resemblance of the Gospels, only make more difficult of explanation the differences, and *vice versâ*. If it be argued that a coincidence, not merely of thought, but of expression, even to the identity in irregular augments and use of cases, indicates that the Evangelists had access to each other's works in whatsoever order, then the differences of arrangement and even of events, of the number of persons here and the scene of action there, lose their natural explanation. It is probable that St. Mark saw the Gospel of St. Matthew; but in that case the omission of the great discourses becomes hard to understand. Much of the later criticism has the tendency to explain the resemblances, but to leave the differences on one side. The time seems almost come when with a hundred volumes before us, each with its own explanation, and each with weapons of destruction ready for every other, we may admit that the explanation will never be forthcoming. Indeed the complications are so great, and the collateral witnesses so few, that the failure is not surprising. As easy would it be for some chemical disciple of Mulder or of Regnault, who came to the subject armed with the knowledge of all the elements that compose a tree, and with all the laws of vegetable physiology, to pretend to trace to its source every particle of the oldest oak in Windsor Forest, and to shew the amount of effect of every storm that visited it for thirty winters of its early progress, and the precise result of the shadow of neighbouring trees, and of the mosses round its roots, and the springs that made dank the soil beneath, and the fungoid growths that soon began to feed upon its superfluity of life. This is beyond science. The first efforts are excusable, if they are vain. But there comes a time for separating the sure from the doubtful, the materials of science from the food of mere conjecture; and here we may venture to say that criticism has failed, and that the

time has come for making this separation. There is another resemblance between the oak and the Gospel. The further examination is not needful, in the one case or the other, for the full use and enjoyment of the truth and of the tree. Whatever the exact share of each cause, the tree has grown to a goodly height; the fowls of the air lodge in the branches of it, the cattle seek shade beneath it, with its mast the birds are fed whilst it is growing and the swine when it has fallen. And in the meantime a great trunk is gathering girth and density, until the time come for the axe being laid at the root, and for the new destiny to which God may have raised the senseless wood; and the acorn thrown by the careless hand of some swineherd in the time of the Tudors, may have grown to carry the flag of the England of to-day, with the mimic thunders of her armament, into the Indian seas, to maintain her imperial sway. So with the books; whatever their root and mode of growth, they were the seed of a mighty tree, of the great church of God. Nor may we complain that we cannot see every step of its growth, if indeed its present stature and beauty are proofs enough that it is divine.

§ 53. *Divine Authority.*—The discussion of the Gospels from a critical point of view must always seem to derogate from their claim to divine authority, their inspiration, unless the claim of the Gospels is in some measure defined. And first it should be observed that there are some things which they do not claim. Not completeness of detail: St. John expressly says (xx. 30, 31; xxi. 25) that this is not to be looked for in a work of so limited an extent. Not exemption from the ordinary conditions of historical research; some of these, St. Luke (i. 1–4) accepts; and the most striking feature of that remarkable preface is the modesty of its claim. Nor do they profess to offer what we should call a biography of Jesus Christ. St. Matthew offers no account of the general scope of his work. St. Mark is writing "the Gospel of the Jesus Christ the son of God." St. Luke has for his subject the things that are surely believed, and in which Theophilus has been instructed, a description which has more to do with a creed than a biography. It is evident that each intends to bring us Christ, but that not one intends to give us every incident in the life that He lived on earth. And they have redeemed the one promise, expressed or implied; they have not attempted the other. One or two illustrations will make this plainer. The genealogy in St. Matthew omits three names, Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah. Now, if a promise, expressed or implied, has been made to record every step in the descent, then this is a fault in the history; but it is urged that St. Matthew does not profess to record in his list the full number of successions to the throne of David, but only of exhibiting the royal pedigree of Jesus Christ; that this genealogy is in all probability a document distinct from the Gospel though incorporated in it, and that like omissions are found in like documents, and elsewhere in Jewish history.[1] If these arguments hold good, then anything like the reproach which writers like Strauss bring against the Gospel on this ground, is turned back. In two Gospels there are two "sermons" of Jesus, alike, yet different in many things. The probability is that they are the same sermon. Now, if St. Matthew is bound by any promise not to put the sermon on the Mount out of its historical place, and not to add to it one word which Jesus did not on that occasion actually deliver, then we should follow the comments of ordinary criticism with exquisite pain, for the sermon is apparently placed earlier than the place assigned by St. Luke, and many matters are introduced which were apparently spoken by the Lord at other times and in other connexions. But if the main purpose of St. Matthew be best answered by the arrangement which he has adopted, and if the wish to place the new law of the Kingdom of Heaven at the very threshold, and to

[1] See Maclellan, 'New Test.' p. 411, who compares II Chron. xxii. 9, where son of Jehoshaphat means grandson; also I Chron. vi. 3–15 with Ez. vii. 1–5, where seven generations are omitted.

exhibit it in complete form, has caused him to adopt an order less usual to us, then we should not judge the Gospel by a law of our own making. That which the critic wishes to extenuate as an imperfection, is in fact a step in the march which the Evangelist means to tread. In what, then, consists the inspiration of the Gospels? Here the proper answer will not be by a theory, but by an examination of the facts of the Holy Scripture itself. Our Lord on four occasions promised to the Apostles a Divine guidance of some kind. He says (Matt. x. 19): "When they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." In St. Luke the same promise is given: "The Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." (Luke xii. 12.) In St. Mark, on another occasion, the same is repeated: "Whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye; for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost" (Mark xiii. 11). In the great discourse of St. John, the form of the promise is different. "The Comforter . . . shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (xiv. 26). "He will guide you into all truth, for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He will shew you things to come" (xvi. 13). Of these promises, the three first are all of one kind; the disciples were to be endowed with a power not their own, in order to face and to answer their persecutors. The last promise is more general: it is a promise of union with God through His Spirit, by which guidance in truth and wisdom shall be given the Apostles, not merely in the crisis of peril, but at all times without limitation. It is not necessary to go minutely into the interpretation of these passages; their general meaning is clear, and whatever that meaning includes, it is certain that it must include the power to give a true picture of the Lord of life and salvation, to those who should listen to the Apostles' preaching. This was their work on earth; this was given them by the Lord to do, and if the guidance did not extend to this, the promise would be delusive. From the history of the Church we know that the Divine guidance of the Spirit has extended to many others besides the Apostles in different ways and measures. But all we are now concerned with is the position of the Apostles. If the promise of Christ was true, they were divinely guided for their work. Now it could not be maintained for a moment that the aid which was given them for their preaching was withdrawn from them when they reduced to writing the same preaching. In point of fact, it is most probable that the teaching and the written book were the same. At any rate, the one and the other were undertaken in strict fulfilment of the commission given to the Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature. This position is only applicable exactly to the two Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John. It is notable however that the early Church has always believed that St. Peter was connected with St. Mark's Gospel, as St. Paul was supposed to be with that of St. Luke. But whether these two were within the scope of the Lord's promise will not depend on the theory that they were connected with two Apostles, though the Church evidently attached much importance to that; the witness of the Church is of greater importance here. She had before her these two Gospels, among a swarm of apocryphal writings, professing to make Christ known; and she fixed on the four and excluded all others, treating these with a peculiar reverence, from which we may infer this, that the Gospels of Mark and Luke, albeit connected with the names of those who were not Apostles, presented the image of the same Christ as the other two, and pointed the same way of salvation. In cleaving to the four, and rejecting the rest, the Church was not guided by any exact theory of inspiration; many theories have been constructed but they are mainly the work of theologians in later times. What she believed was that in these books there was the truth, and

that it was written under divine guidance, and this was sufficient. One of the oldest theories of inspiration is that each writer was as an instrument in the hand of the Almighty, uttering the sounds which the player moved it to utter, and contributing no more to the divine music than does the flute or pipe to the air that the musician makes. With this theory any *degrees* of inspiration would be incompatible. Now the Jewish writers always seem to have recognised degrees: from the "Bath Kol," "Daughter of the Voice," up to the prophetic Vision, and to the high and peculiar inspiration enjoyed by Moses there were several grades.[1] But are there not traces in the New Testament of the Doctrine of Degrees? When St. Paul is advising on the subject of marriage, he says, "She is happier if she so abide, after my judgment; and I think also that I have the spirit of God" (1 Cor. vii. 40). This would hardly be consistent with the position that St. Paul knew himself to be as an instrument played on by the hand of the Almighty. He seems to assume that he is using his own judgment, with a strong impression at the same time that it is a judgment in accordance with the mind of Christ. In another passage he says, "That which I speak, I speak it not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly, in the confidence of boasting" (2 Cor. xi. 17). These passages are quite consistent with the old Jewish view of inspiration: that God inspired the prophet through his reason and mind, and that the more the prophet was left in the possession of his natural powers and reason, the higher the grade of inspiration; but they are not consistent with the mere mechanical view that God took possession of every faculty, suspending and superseding it, in order to use as a mouthpiece or amanuensis, the chosen writer.[2] Nor can this last view be reconciled with any of the conclusions of criticism, seeing that a single peculiarity of any kind in one of the writers would be inconsistent with it. Nor could any question of small and great be admitted to alter the case; want of harmony, even in a single word, would overthrow the theory as effectually as greater deviations. Nor is such a form of inspiration the highest, according to the Jewish view of the Old Testament writers. The inspiration which, leaving the faculties of the inspired speaker in their force and fulness, added to him a light and zeal and knowledge, such as exceed all that he could have shewn without the divine aid, has seemed to the old doctors of the law, of a higher kind. And such an inspiration seems best to agree with the facts of the New Testament. That St. Matthew exhibits one kind of character in his Gospel, and St. John another, is admitted by all critics of every school; and this must arise from the two being of different natures and gifts, and placed in different circumstances when they wrote. The Holy Spirit is one and unchangeable, but He acts on divers natures in different ways, and uses them according to their faculties of reason and opportunities of knowledge. The Apostles felt this when they resolved (Acts i.) to choose into the vacant place of an Apostle one who had companied with them all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them: such a one would be a qualified witness, and the Holy Spirit would give him the

[1] See John Smith's 'Select Discourses on Prophecy,' p. 252. (Cambridge, 1673.)

[2] "The ancients, indeed, were accustomed to say, . . . that the sacred writers were as pens in the hand of the Spirit, or as harps, from which He drew what sounds He pleased. These representations were, however, intended simply to illustrate one point, namely, that the words uttered or recorded by inspired men, were the words of God. The Church has never held what has been stigmatised as the mechanical theory of inspiration. The sacred writers were not machines. Their self-consciousness was not suspended; nor were their intellectual powers superseded. Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. It was men, not machines; not unconscious instruments, but living, thinking, willing minds, whom the Spirit used as His organs. Nor did inspiration interfere with the free exercise of the distinctive mental characteristics of the individual. If a Hebrew was inspired, he spake Hebrew; if a Greek, he *spake* Greek; if an educated man, he *spake* as a man of culture; if uneducated, he *spoke* as such a man is wont to speak. If his mind was logical, he reasoned, as Paul did; if emotional, he wrote as John wrote. All this is involved in the fact that God uses His instruments according to their nature."—HODGE, 'Systematic Theology,' vol. i. p. 156.

light which he needed. On the other view, that this inspired teacher was a mechanical instrument, the less he had seen of the Lord, the more remarkable would his evidence have been; and one who had never seen Him, would have furnished the most striking proof of the miraculous power of the Spirit. But it has pleased God to act in another manner, and to select those who both by their past knowledge and by the aid of the divine light, might make the news of salvation known. The writings of St. Paul are still more difficult to explain on the other hypothesis. Not only are they full of marks of individual character, but the Apostle Himself calls attention to the fact that his love, his confidence, what he calls his "boasting," his hopes of an eternal crown, are truly his, separable from, and in some cases actually separated from the light of the divine Spirit, the actual presence of which with him, to guide and enlighten his life, he never for one hour forgets. In the Old Testament, the counterpart of St. Paul is David; and no reader of the psalms can doubt that many of their words and incidents are from David's personal life; no one can doubt that this is what gives the book its deepest value. If the fifty-first psalm is the real outpouring of David's penitence, for a sin all too real, it is full of meaning for all sinners. If, on the other hand, which no Jewish commentary supposes, it is but the impassive utterance of the Holy Spirit, to which David furnishes only the subservient mouth or the mechanical hand of the scribe, then it must be read in a new sense, and with a different attitude from that in which the Church has ever regarded it. No doubt the words of the Lord to the Apostles, in St. Matthew and St. Mark, as quoted above, are such as to seem at first to give colour to the view of dictation. They belong however to a well-known class of negative sentences, in which the first member is a denial, made in order to give rhetorical force to the second. "He that believeth on Me, believeth not on Me, but on Him that sent Me" (John xii. 44). This cannot mean that a believer is not a believer; the sense is brought out by the comment, "He that believeth on Me is *not to be thought of as believing on Me*, but on Him that sent Me." In like manner, "thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God," cannot mean that there had been no lie unto men; the facts shew the contrary; but that the lie unto men is not to *be thought of* in comparison to the lie to God. The negative is one of thought rather than of things: "Do not think of . . . but of . . ." &c.[1] Upon the whole, the Scripture passages are consistent with the view of a divine assistance, complete for its purpose, which the divine writers enjoyed; but they do not give the means of constructing a precise theory of the mode and measure of the inspiration. The practical question for the Church is, why do we believe that the evangelists enjoyed a divine light in the work which they performed? The answer would be: 1. That we are told in the New Testament that not only the Apostles but the Seventy, and the brethren at large, did in fact enjoy and exercise this divine gift in many ways. And if it is said that it is arguing in a circle to prove the Gospels by the witness of the Gospels, the testimony of St. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10) makes it clear that the existence of some supernatural gifts in his time, is a matter beyond argument. He speaks of them as calmly as he would of the collection for the saints or the fact of his imprisonment. Now it is impossible to think that these gifts were shed abroad in such profusion and such diversity, and yet withheld from those on whose work the whole of the future preaching of the church must needs depend. 2. That it was not so withheld, was the general belief of the whole church; it may be assumed here that by the year 150 or thereabouts the Four Gospels had taken their place as the accredited accounts of the life of the Lord. 3. But the first place in the evidence will always belong to the contents of the Gospels. They bring before us Christ; and He is Divine. This argument has prevailed with some who would not have yielded

[1] See Winer, 'New Test. Dict.' 3, sect. 55; Luke x. 20, is a case of the same kind.

to any other. "Jewish writers," says Rousseau, "would never have invented that tone—that morality. And the Gospel has marks of truth so great and striking, so perfectly inimitable, that the inventor of them would be more astonishing even than the hero."[1] If it could be seriously apprehended that the church and mankind would ever allow itself to be robbed of the Divine picture and presentment of Christ, because of some real or fancied discrepancy between the four Evangelists; that it would part with the precious substance of harmony, for the sake of some shadow of harmony, never to be found in any books, and never promised to us in these; then we might tremble for the future of religion. But they have come down to us so far, not upon the strength of a historical argument that they were indeed what they are supposed to be, but upon the inward force, by which they first shew us Christ, and then lead us captive to Christ. Never man spake like this Man; never was love like this love; never such a life was seen on earth before; never did the dream of poet, never the instinct of hero-worship imagine such a being with such wisdom on his lips, such love in His heart, with a character so balanced and complete, with claims so outspoken and so lofty, joined to so profound a humility and so gentle a kindness towards the gainsayer. If, indeed, as Geiger and others tell us, he is but a disciple of Hillel, following exactly in his master's footsteps, let us see this Hillel brought forth, that we may admire another, also divine! Every one knows, and Delitzsch has taken the trouble to shew,[2] that there is indeed no comparison possible. The two genealogies may be difficult; the taxing of Cyrenius a perpetual problem; the day of the last passover may exercise critics to the end. But do or do not the Four Gospels conduct us into the presence of the same Jesus? This is the real issue. The Church has long since settled her conviction on this point; in the Gospels, each and all, she has known Christ. And if the life and character of Jesus transcend the power of man's invention, then there must be some cause higher than man's invention for such a portrait: if the hand is not human that drew it, then it must be something more than human. But we may go farther. The claim for greater evidence for the Gospels, and a more exact agreement in every detail, is purely artificial and arbitrary. No other books among those which we read with undoubting faith in their genuineness, have such evidence to shew for their descent. Let any one think how he would set about the proof that Virgil wrote the Æneid as we have it, or Plato his Republic, and he will hardly be able to make a first step. Justin Martyr, about the middle of the second century, has quoted the Gospels so freely, that we are assured of their existence at that time and of the substance of their contents. His quotations are not indeed verbally exact; but if we try to evade the admission that he quotes our Gospels, on the ground of these verbal differences, then the alternative emerges, of a fifth witness to the main facts of the Gospel, including all those which place our Redeemer on the throne of Divine Sonship, in the Gospel by Justin.[1] If Justin did indeed compose a Gospel for himself out of the materials that had come down to him, then those materials become new evidence. It is however certain that Justin knew the histories of the Lord's life, which we call the Gospels. But we are asked to apply to these histories a test of perfect verbal agreement, which would not apply to any other histories. Why should we expect it to apply here? It is answered "because these books are divine;" but why should an amount of agreement which would be servile imitation in ordinary writers, be an appropriate attribute of inspiration? The Jews, who were not wanting in reverence for their sacred books, recognised various degrees of inspiration, and the lowest was that in which the ear alone was engaged, and an external voice was the

[1] 'Émile.'
[2] 'Jesus and Hillel.'

[1] See an ingenious argument, which forms the substance of Mr. Sadler's work, 'The Lost Gospel.'

source: the next was the dream, in which the mind and not the ear received the inspiration, whilst the bodily and mental powers were in abeyance; the next was the waking vision, in which the mind that received the divine impression was awake and active: whilst the highest of all, vouchsafed to Moses alone, was that in which there was not even a vision, but a direct communication from God, to the soul and spirit of His servant. But in the Church some writers have inverted this order, and they demand for their conception of the highest inspiration a complete overruling of the faculties of the writers. The Old Testament and the New are alike inspired: and it is not certain that Maimonides is wrong and the Christian theorist right. For neither theory can the express declaration of Holy Scripture be claimed: if it could, the question would be decided. With regard to the need of verbal agreement, Tholuck has shewn that no other histories exhibit it or are expected to do so. Does St. Mark omit the sermon on the Mount? Curtius relates the vengeance which Alexander the Great took on the Branchidæ, because the family from which they descended had betrayed the Temple of Apollo, at Miletus, to Xerxes: Arrian says nothing about it. The first inclination would be to think that what the credulous Curtius relates, and the more trustworthy Arrian passes over, never took place. But Strabo also records it and quotes Callisthenes in illustration; why then is Arrian silent? No account can be given of the silence. When did Alexander the Great die? On the evening of the eleventh of June, say Eumenes and Diodotus: on the thirteenth of June, witness Aristobulus and Ptolemy, who were beside his deathbed. How long had he reigned? Aristobulus makes 12 years; Cornelius Nepos and Livy, 13; while Justin gives 35 years and a month.

§ 54. *Evidence from the Existence of the Church.*—The modern theories of the Gospels are all framed to give a more natural explanation of the existence of the Gospels than that which the Church has always held. But the explanations only seem to make the difficulties greater. That the Apostles, consciously or unconsciously, invented the character of Jesus and His life, and then persuaded a man like St. Paul to stake his life, to unsay all his former beliefs, to compass sea and land to preach the Gospel, upon the faith of this life and character, which were, according to Strauss and others, no more real than the character of Hamlet, is not credible. St. Paul lived at the time of these events, and was full of prejudice against the innovation of Christianity; and yet it is supposed that the growth of many Gospels, to which somehow every fresh workman added something from his own hand, took place under his very eyes, and that out of the slenderest historical basis the living Christ was evolved, to be the wonder and the love of all succeeding ages; and yet that St. Paul could not discover this, either by his own religious tact or by ordinary inquiry; that he preached the resurrection of a Christ not risen, and the Divine Sonship of a Galilean artisan, and the eternal consequence of a revelation which, when inspected at its source, would be found to be hatched out of the accumulated dreams of a little fanatical sect. This satisfied Strauss; and another theory, equally unsubstantial, satisfied Baur; but each has its own difficulties, and we must be pardoned for thinking the old account the simplest and the best. Let the argument be extended a little further. How can the existence of the Christian Church be accounted for on the theory of myths or of "tendency"? Christ risen, Christ Divine: such is the sum of the ancient creed. From the first day to the present this was preached without stint; the sacrament which gave a peculiar and miraculous value to the death of Jesus was celebrated from the death of Jesus onward. And did the people who thus believed and thus celebrated know, one with another, that the miraculous part of the records was their own work? Did they watch the Gospel growing as a plant under their watering and their increasing? Incredible self-deceit! which cannot be made respectable, though it is made more wonderful by the fact that it was sealed in their

blood. The presence of Christ, such as we know Him, in the Gospels and in the heart of the Church, is a fact that should be accounted for, and in attenuating to almost nothing the basis of true history, modern criticism has gone far to make the fact utterly unintelligible. The words of Theodore Parker, who did not accept the Gospel history, place this difficulty in its most startling form :

"Try Him as we try other teachers. They deliver their word: find a few waiting for the consolation, who accept the new tidings, follow the new method; and some go beyond their teacher, though less mighty minds than He. . . . Eighteen centuries have passed since the tide of humanity rose so high in Jesus. What man, what sect, what Church has mastered His thought, comprehended His method, and so fully applied it to life? Let the world answer in its cry of anguish. Men have parted His raiment among them, cast lots for His seamless coat; but that spirit which toiled so manfully in a world of sin and death, which died and suffered and overcame the world —is that found, possessed, understood?"[1]

§ 55. *The Supernatural in the Gospels.*—The impossible task has been often lately undertaken, to clear the life and the person of Jesus Christ of all supernatural elements. From whatever side we view the sacred history, the supernatural part of it strikes us the first. Of written testimony St. Paul's Epistles are the earliest. St. Paul preaches Jesus and the Resurrection, and knows no other foundation of the faith. The synoptic Gospels are full of His miracles, leading up to the crowning miracle of the Resurrection. The Fourth Gospel opens with a passage that assigns Divine power and pre-existence to the Lord, the Word. In the Apocalypse the glorified Redeemer is seen clothed with Divine attributes (Rev. i. 8; iv. 8; i. 11, 17; ii. 8; xxii. 13). Pliny the younger reports to Trajan that the Christians worshipped Christ as God. From the Epistle of Clement of Rome the supernatural character of Christ could not be erased so as to leave anything coherent and intelligible behind. It is plain that all historical Christianity contains the supernatural element: a Christianity without it would be, not a history, but a speculation. Moreover, the Resurrection of the Lord is a fact of such a kind as to carry with it many of the other facts of the Gospel, and to make minute discussions about them of less moment. If Christ did rise indeed, then He revealed Himself thereby as supernatural; and that being granted, the question in which the old Rationalists were so much interested, whether some of the miracles ought not be accounted for by natural causes, loses its interest. The life of Christ is a supernatural revelation to us, for He who rose from the dead is not as other men, but is Divine. If so, then it is not at all surprising that these miracles fell from Him: it helps no one to explain them away; the wonder would be if one who could work that great wonder should work no others. It has often been remarked that miracles, when they come to be read as history, long after they took place, have lost some of their value as evidences; because they do not appeal to the witness of the eye and ear, but have come to depend upon historical testimony, which itself may want evidence to support it. But there always was a certain risk in appealing to miracles alone. The Lord, when He wrought the miracles with His power, bade the witnesses to keep silence about them. That His person and His works should both be seen, and seen together, was the meaning probably of this reserve. Since Christ is the Son of God, there must be connected with Him miracle and prophecy: to suppose otherwise would be to suppose a supernatural Being, who was tied to act and speak in a manner not supernatural: and on the other hand, the natural philosopher would accept this challenge, and would say, "It is because I do not admit the existence of any supernatural Being in the garb and veil of flesh, that I wish to get rid of prophecy, which is supernatural utter-

[1] In Schaff's 'Person of Christ' the testimony of many unbelievers is collected, pp. 251–370.

ance, and of miracle, which is supernatural action." It is clear, then, that the controversy about miracles is knit up with the controversy about Christ. If the works testified of Christ, as they did, Christ also, in some sense, testifies to the works. It is supposed that "the laws of nature" do not leave place for miracles. But one may say, with Rothe, that this phrase "laws of nature," held up as a head of Medusa before us at every turn, has no terrors for us; that God in imposing laws on nature, has not submitted to them His almighty will; that we should need to know far more of the laws of nature, before we attributed to them, as some people do, a rigid inflexibility, in which the idea of God is extinguished, and man becomes a machine. The argument that miracles are, not so much impossible, as unlikely, that the testimony needs to be very strong to overcome the antecedent improbability of a miracle, has just this much truth in it, that where everything betokens that nature is running her ordinary course, the interposition of an isolated or aimless miracle could not be looked for, or readily believed. But when Jesus was born in Bethlehem, when Jesus died on Calvary, things were not in their ordinary course. A wonderful life, and the promise of a wonderful work for man, were accompanied by wonders wrought for men. It was unlikely that lepers should be cleansed, and the lame should walk, and the dead should rise: but then it was unlikely that Christ should come, Who came but once and for ever. Hence we revert to the same point, the whole of revelation should be known and studied together. Christ should be seen in and with His works, in order to appreciate the works and the doer of them. Modern science has not made the belief in miracles one whit more difficult: the pantheist and the materialist cannot accept them, and they never could, for one makes the world his God, and the other, instead of a god, takes the "laws of nature" for his fetish. But now, as always, the believer in God can believe in miracles, for this last belief is only the tenet that God is free to work in His own world.[1]

§ 56. *Evidence for the Gospel Collections.*—The change of opinion in recent times, as to the date of the Gospels, has been already alluded to. The theory of the Tübingen School, that the Gospels were gradually evolved by the Church, through a series of alterations, prompted by the "tendency" towards the teaching of St. Peter or St. Paul, between whom a fierce rivalry was assumed to exist, required a long time for its main condition. Accordingly it was thought that the Gospels, as we know them, were not in existence before the close of the second century. Hardly any one now holds a conclusion which, but for the needs of a theory, would never have found a friend among the learned. It is desirable to indicate here the evidence for the time of the acceptance of the Gospel collection in the Church. Irenæus was bishop of Lyons from 178, and suffered martyrdom under Septimius Severus in 202. His great work was written before the close of the second century. It contains about 400 quotations from the Gospels, of which 80 are from the Gospel of St. John. The document called the "Muratorian Fragment," was probably prepared about 170; it is mutilated in the portion relating to the Gospels, but it mentions Luke as the third, and John as the fourth. The ancient version of the New Testament into Latin, known as the 'Versio Itala,' was in existence by the end of the second century; for both Tertullian in his quotations from Irenæus, and the early translator of Irenæus make use of it. This Latin version, as well as the Peshito, a Syriac version, which bears date perhaps a little later, after the close of the second century, place at the beginning, and in the present order, the four Gospels. None of these authorities is to be regarded as a mere isolated date. Irenæus would not quote hundreds of

[1] Many works on this subject have lately appeared. The lamented Professor Mozley's Lectures; Mr. Row's recent Bampton Lectures, and his 'Supernatural in the Gospels,' are among them. Also L. Bonnet, 'Miracle dans la Vie du Sauveur,' Paris, 1867.

passages from works which had just been put into his hands. He witnesses, not only to the fact that he himself possessed them, but to the fact—more important for us—that they were known and in use with others, and already carried high authority and weight. The "Muratorian Fragment," in like manner, is a list of works already known. The "Versio Itala" is a testimony to the fact that a Latin translation of the New Testament collection had become needed in the second century; therefore the works that compose it must have already come into notice and have acquired authority. This remark applies to what Irenæus tells of the number of the Gospels:[1] the Ebionites, the Nazareans, and Marcion, had each one Gospel only. Irenæus has many reasons for the exact number four. There are four quarters of the world, therefore four Gospels. The Cherubim were of four forms, and so are the Gospels. The Gospel is the support of the Church, and it has four columns. In the section just before, he assumes that the Heretics, whilst choosing to employ only one of the Gospels, might have access to the whole; and it does not appear to him that he need limit the time when this began to be the case. He knew the Gospels, and never knew a time when they were not known.[2] Thus the testimony is not to a fact of the date of 180 or 190, but it is retrospective.

A step backwards conducts us to the works of Justin the Martyr. Born about the beginning of the second century at Flavia Neapolis, a Roman colony, nearly on the site of the ancient Sichem, he tried to satisfy his craving for knowledge, first from a Stoic teacher, and then from a Peripatetic, and lastly from a Platonist. A chance encounter, as it seemed, led him to seek wisdom of Christ alone. In teaching and in writing he strove zealously to spread the knowledge of the true Christ; and we still possess three books which are the genuine productions of his pen—the two Apologies and the dialogue with Trypho.[1] The dates of these must be about the middle of the century; Justin suffered martyrdom about 166. In these books quotations of Holy Scripture abound, but certain peculiarities have made them the cause of much controversy. It would be impossible to discuss them here in detail; a volume would hardly suffice for the purpose.

But some results may be stated, upon which considerable reliance may be placed: 1. The quotations of Justin from the Gospels are very numerous; about 110 from St. Matthew, 14 from St. Mark, 57 from St. Luke, and 29 from St. John—in all more than 200. 2. These are of every class; the exact verbal reproduction, the quotation with verbal agreement accompanied with some variations, the mere allusion with little or no verbal agreement. 3. The predominant mode of quotation is somewhat inexact, as though the quotations were from memory. But this applies to the Old Testament quotations as well as to the New; and it cannot therefore be inferred that the passages that resemble New Testament quotations are taken in reality from some other books, such as apocryphal Gospels, or from oral tradition. 4. The quotations are for the most part anonymous: some of them purport to be given from the general source—the "Memoirs of the Apostles," where we should expect a reference to St. Matthew or to St. Luke. But the actual reference even to this general source is only made about seven times. The practice, however, of quoting New Testament writings without reference to the name of the writer is very frequent in later Apologists; in Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus. In Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, both of whom quote the Evangelists frequently by name, the same anonymous mode of quotation is found in certain apologetic works; and this may be accounted for by the fact that apologetic works are addressed to those with whom names of authors would carry no weight. 5. The historical

[1] See Cont. Hær. III. ii. 8, 9, ed. Stieren.
[2] Olshausen, 'Aechtheit,' p. 272.

[1] The edition of Otto is the best. A good translation is found in the 'Library of the Fathers' (Oxford).

events that Justin quotes are such as our Gospels contain. In the history of the childhood, he does not introduce apocryphal matter, such as certain spurious Gospels would have abundantly supplied. Of the middle portion of the life of the Lord he records nothing. To the close the same remark applies; his events are those of our Gospels. 6. If the variations from our written Gospels are many, there is no written Gospel in existence to which these variations can, with the slightest probability, be referred. 7. That they are to be referred, in part at least, to failure of memory is evident from the fact that the same passages are quoted more than once, but with variations which would be inconsistent with the theory of another written document, quite as much as with the supposition that our Gospels are used. Of the seven passages where direct reference is made to the "Memoirs" as the source, Professor Westcott[1] reckons that five are in verbal agreement with St. Matthew or St. Luke; the sixth is "He called Himself the Son of God: let Him come down, *and walk;* let God save Him:"[2] but this seems to give the spirit of St. Mark's words "Let the Christ.... come down from the Cross, that we may see and believe." The seventh[3] is also a distinct variation from a reading of St. Matthew, but is not such as could not be accounted for as a various reading of a MS. 8. In a very few cases, Justin seems to draw from some other source than the Canonical Gospels; but the number of such cases is very small, and we have no indication of the probable source. 9. In many cases the transitions from one of the Gospels to another are very marked and abrupt; indicating an intention to combine the two narratives.[4] A good example of this is the quotations from the Sermon on the Mount in Apol. I. 15, where the two accounts of St. Matthew and St. Luke are closely intermingled. 10. The whole of the facts are such that there is far stronger warrant for believing that Justin has used the synoptic Gospels, than that he has employed some other Gospel to us unknown. 11. The loss of such unknown Gospel could not well be accounted for; because Justin mentions that the "Memoirs" were used for public reading in the churches, and this would give a guarantee for their preservation. Irenæus, twenty or thirty years later, speaks of the four Gospels as established in paramount authority. That Justin's Gospel should have been a different one, and that such a Gospel, so full, so near the four, should have perished, so that Irenæus did not even mention it, is a violent supposition. 12. The Gospel of St. Matthew is quoted most frequently and most distinctly; the Gospel of St. Mark is clearly quoted, but on account of the small amount of matter peculiar to that Evangelist the number of quotations is small. About St. Luke there has been more controversy: but Zeller concludes "that Justin knew and employed a third Gospel: but relatively to the whole of his Gospel quotations, the use he made of it seems to have been limited, and we must therefore conclude that the Gospel had not in his eyes the same importance as those of which he made more extensive use, and that it was not the original source of his knowledge of the Evangelical history."[1] We quote the last part of this opinion that the exact amount of Zeller's concession may be seen: but it is only true in reference to St. Matthew, and is an illustration of a remark already made that from the first the Gospel of St. Matthew became the natural source from which Christian writers drew their quotations, as to things common to several Evangelists. 13. The description of the "Memoirs" (in Dial. c. Tryph. 103) that they "were composed by Apostles and their followers" (by which words he introduces a quotation from St. Luke) are applicable to the Gospels, two of which were from the hands of Apostles and two from followers; but it could not apply

[1] 'Canon,' p. 130.
[2] Dial. 101.
[3] Dial. 100.
[4] There does not, however, seem to be any sufficient ground for Mr. Sanday's suggestion that Justin used a Harmony of the Gospels.

[1] 'Acts of the Apostles,' Introduction.

to any other set of books of which we have any account.

This, then, is the general aspect of the case as regards the Synoptical Gospels and Justin Martyr. A second stage of knowledge, proceeding backwards, has been reached. Irenæus knew the four; was sure that they were but four; believed that heretics had used and corrupted them. Justin Martyr, but a few years earlier, also knew the four. Nor were they new to him, they had grown into a high place by degrees; they were read in churches as men read the inspired scriptures of the Old Testament. Here, too, the testimony is retrospective.[1]

It has been already said that Marcion's knowledge and use of St. Luke's Gospel may be taken as practically proved. At what date this Gnostic became acquainted with the third Gospel, and thought fit to make a revision and abridgment of it, it is impossible to prove. According to Irenæus (iii. 4, 3) Marcion's doctrine was spread in Rome at the time of Anicetus; and this date can be fixed with some confidence at 150–160: but at the date of Justin's first Apology (about 139) Marcion is spoken of as having been long in the full tide of his mischievous success (i. 27, 58). This makes it probable that the date given by Irenæus is too late by many years. We have no means of knowing whether he revised the third Gospel at the beginning of his career, or at some late point in it: that his dogmatic preconceptions were, in some measure formed, is plain from the nature of the revision itself, and from the rejection of the Gospels of Matthew and John, which were also known to Marcion. Some time between 130 and 150 the date of the revision would be found. Now Marcion is the first of whom it is known that he determined a Canon of the New Testament: it contained the Gospel and ten of the Epistles of St. Paul. A mutilated list, it is true: but it is of no small importance that ten epistles, which must have been written before A.D. 65, were recognised at that time. Still more important, however, is the fact that St. Luke's Gospel was found in use, and of such authority as to be the foundation of the Gospel, at the time when this heretic wrote.

From this second stage, the period of Justin and Marcion, a further step backward, places us in the close of the first century. Here the traces of the Gospels are far more scanty and indistinct. The works of Ignatius are the subject of too much controversy to serve the present purpose.[1] In the earliest form, the words "Be wise as a serpent in all things, and harmless as a dove," recall Matt. x. 16. Another allusion to "a star" is too obscure in the shorter or "Curetonian" form of the epistles, to build any comparison upon. Thus there is but one quotation, and that from St. Matthew. But it is quite as remarkable that there are none from the Old Testament.

Of the epistles of Clement of Rome the first alone can be pronounced genuine: its date may be safely fixed as lying between A.D. 93 and A.D. 97; in this the great majority of good opinions would agree. A more precise date cannot be assigned, nor is it needed for the present purpose.[2] The recent discovery of a second MS of this document has lent a new interest to the study of it. Of verbal coincidences with St. Paul's writings, of the tendency in this Epistle to combine into one the elements of Christian truth, which in the inspired Epistles had been left in contrast, as in the case of the doctrine of faith and works in St. Paul and in St. James; of the traces of moods of thought fashioned after St. John; of the beginnings of church organisation and liturgical service in this document, it is not possible to speak here. Only the most certain

[1] The whole subject has been very ably handled by many writers. Hilgenfeld has collected with elaborate care (Evangelien Justin's, pp. 101, *seq.*) all the citations from the Gospels. Norton ('Genuineness') has discussed them, but less fully. See Credner ('Kanon'), Sanday ('Gospels in the Second Century'), Westcott ('Canon,' also 'Introduction to Gospels').

[1] The controversy is excellently examined by Professor Lightfoot, 'Contemporary Review,' Feb. 1875.

[2] See the new edition of Clement by Gebhardt and Harnack (Prolegomena), Leipsic, 1876, where all the dates are brought together; also Lightfoot's second volume and Appendix.

elements are available to those who have not space to discuss and defend the less certain.[1] There are, however, two passages in which the Gospels appear to be expressly quoted; the former of which is as follows: "Remembering especially the words of the Lord Jesus which He spoke to inculcate meekness and long-suffering. For thus He spoke: Show pity that ye may be pitied; forgive that it may be forgiven unto you; as ye do, so shall it be done unto you; as ye give, so shall it be given unto you; as ye judge, so shall ye be judged; as ye shew kindness, so shall kindness be shewn unto you; with what measure ye mete, in that it shall be measured to you again" (Ch. xiii.). It is obvious that this passage agrees exactly with no passage in St. Matthew or St. Luke; but it is also plain, on comparing the Greek texts, that the whole of it, except the words "as ye shew kindness, so shall kindness be shewn unto you," is found in substance in these passages, Matt. v. 7; vi. 14; vii. 2, 12; Luke vi. 31, 36, 37, 38. And though the words "as ye shew kindness," &c., have no exact counterpart in the Gospels, yet they are so close to the spirit of the whole passage that a person quoting from memory would find it not unnatural to interpolate them. A certain class of writers who, strongly prejudiced, like to write in the character of "an unprejudiced person," seize on the small differences to prove that "an uncanonical Gospel" is here quoted. *Which* uncanonical Gospel? We possess a great many; and this passage is not like any of them. It is very like two canonical Gospels; it is just what a person quoting from recollection, and more anxious to exhibit at one view the Lord's teaching than to direct His utterances by a reference to books which, though known to his readers from public instruction, were not perhaps in their hands, would be likely to write. It is poor logic to say, "This is not quite like the canonical Gospels, and therefore it must be quite like some uncanonical Gospel that no one now can find." The resemblance to our Gospels is greater here than the resemblance to the Old Testament in an allusion to Rahab just before. (LIGHTFOOT.)

The second passage is as follows:—"For He [Jesus] said, Woe to that man: it were good for him that he had not been born, rather than that he should offend one of My elect: it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about him and he drowned in the sea, rather than that he should offend one of my little ones" (ch. xlvi.). The substance of this is contained in Matt. xxvi. 24; xviii. 6; Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 2; but it does not reproduce any one of these places exactly. The "unprejudiced person" will at once resort to an "uncanonical Gospel," of which, however, no trace can be produced; but those whose ideas are less emancipated may resort to the common-sense solution, that the author is quoting from memory, and that from that point of view he has excellently given the spirit of the passages. In the words "offend," "millstone," "drowned," "little ones," he has followed one or other of the three Gospels; and as the three Gospels do not verbally agree, there is some room for the remark that "Clement does not differ from the Synoptics more than they differ from each other." (SANDAY.)

§ 57. *Summary.*—These glimpses into various periods of the Church give some very important results. There is no attempt here to survey the whole of the literature.[1] The various steps are as follows:—In the last quarter of the second century the four Gospels were established and recognised, and held a place that was refused to all other memoirs of the Lord. At the end of the second quarter they were quoted largely, though not very exactly; but the authors' names were not made prominent; they were "me-

[1] See Lightfoot, 'Clement of Rome;' Westcott, 'History of Canon;' Sanday, 'Gospels in the Second Century;' and especially the new edition of Clement above referred to.

[1] C. Tischendorf's tract, 'Wann wurden,' u. s. w., has been translated into English, 'When were our Gospels written?' It is an argument that has not been refuted. Mr. Sanday, 'Gospels in the Second Century,' p. 382, gives a useful analytical catalogue of the chief writings of the first two centuries.

moirs," they were "the Gospel," and the like. At the opening of the second century the words of the Lord were quoted with unmistakable resemblance to passages of our Gospels which, however, are quoted loosely, without any reference to names of authors, and with a throwing together of the passages from all three Gospels. In Barnabas (A.D. 100–125) and the short ('Curetonian') Ignatius (A.D. 107–115), there is a lack of distinct quotation from the Gospels; and even in the later Hermas (A.D. 135–140) there are no quotations from either Old or New Testament.

§ 58. *Use of the Gospels in Public Worship.*—The public worship of the Church was the means, no doubt, of the gradual establishment of the four Gospels in their place of eminence. The records are few, but they are significant. The first brethren (Acts ii. 42) commenced at once a systematic form of worship, of which the doctrine of the Apostles, the sacramental breaking of bread, and prayers were the components. The apostolic doctrine, at that time nowhere reduced to writing, must have consisted of the narratives of the Apostles as to things they had witnessed, or of those who had heard them, repeating their testimony at second hand. Clement of Rome speaks of the offerings and service to be performed to God at stated times and hours (I. xl.), as appointed by God: but from these general words we cannot gather what place the apostolic teaching held in this worship. Worship, however, there was, and it was a divinely appointed duty: and we may believe that "doctrine" had not ceased to form part of it. From Pliny's letter to Trajan (Letters, b. X. 97), it is clear that in the first decade of the second century, the worship of Christ as God, in prayer and sacrament, was continued, and that it had so spread that the very temples had become deserted: the preaching is not mentioned, but it seems to be implied. Justin Martyr is a witness whose explicitness leaves nothing to be desired: "On the day which is called Sunday, there is an assembly in the same place of all who live in cities or in country districts, and the records of the Apostles, or the writings of the Prophets are read as long as we have time" (Apol. i. 67). The rest of this account is so distinct that we can reproduce every part of the public worship of A.D. 140. The records of the Apostles are here put upon the same footing as the inspired books of the Old Testament; a great advance. Brief as are these data, they suffice to shew the general course of growth of canonical authority. First the oral doctrine of Apostles, or of those whom they deputed;[1] then the reading of such written records of apostolic doctrine as each church might have within its reach: and then the gradual overshadowing of the other records by the four canonical Gospels, so that all the rest disappeared, and were remitted by the Church to a far lower level. "We cannot," writes Bleek,[1] "exactly say when, or how, it came to pass that the Church considered the collection of canonical Gospels closed with these four alone. The conclusion seems to have been formed and established gradually, without any express conferences or decisions of councils, and without the judgment and practice of any one church being considered as authoritative and regulative for the rest. On this account we have all the more reason to recognise the hand of Providence in the matter, and to believe that the Church was led to a right decision, there having been no other gospels extant in the end of the second century of similar worth, or in similar esteem with our four. We are confirmed in this by a comparison of the other gospel histories which have come down to us with the four canonical Gospels. Though they present affinities, especially with our synoptic Gospels, there is more or less of what is strange and foreign, and they evidently fail to give us the gospel history so faithfully and unaltered as do these four."

§ 59. *Conclusion.*—Let not the faith of any be perplexed that God has wrought by this method—that He has given the Gospels their position, not suddenly, but by growth. It was the mode in which Christ Himself overcame, and He whose worship had

[1] 'Einleitung,' § 242.

emptied the temples in Pliny's time, was, seventy years earlier, the leader of a small band of fishermen on the Galilæan lake. As fissures in the old temple began to gape and foreshew its ruin, the stones of the new and spiritual temple took shape and hardened. The same yearning sense of need which had demanded the books, found for them by degrees, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, their places as corner-stones of the spiritual house. Some preconceptions may be shaken by the sight of this gradual growth, but upon reflection we may find in it fresh ground of admiration—a fresh proof of the harmony and unity that marks the divine plan. As the marvel of vegetable life was wrought upon the mineral globe by growth and by slow degrees at God's command, as the marvel of animal life was superinduced by the same Power upon a world clothed with trees for shelter and with plants for food by a gradual process, so did the true teaching of the Holy Ghost, in a space of about a century and a half, by gradual conquest, from its inherent power, and not by signs from heaven or testifying portents, take its place throughout the Churches; and the less authentic accounts, or the traditions that grew daily paler disappeared as mists before the Sun of Righteousness, and long before the second century closed there were four Gospels only, and in them one Christ.

---

## THE FOLLOWING WORKS HAVE BEEN REFERRED TO, AMONGST OTHERS, IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS INTRODUCTION.


Andrews, 'Life of our Lord.' New York, 1863.

Baumgarten, 'Geschichte Jesu.' Brunswick, 1859.
Beard, 'Voices of Church in reply to Strauss.' 1845.
Birks, 'Difficulties of Belief.' London, 1876.
Bleek, 'Einleitung.' Berlin, 1862.
Bleek, 'Erklärung.' Leipsic, 1862.
Bruder's edition of Schmidt's 'Concordance.' Leipsic, 1842.
Bunsen, 'Hidden Wisdom of Christ.' London, 1865. 2 vols.

Caspari, 'Leben Jesu.' Hamburg, 1869.
Clausen, 'Tabulæ Synopticæ.' 1829.
Clemens Romanus, by Gebhardt and Harnack. Leipsic, 1876.
Cohen, 'Pharisiens.' Paris, 1877. 2 vols.
Colani, 'Croyances messianiques.' Strasburg, 1864.
'Contemporary Review.' 1874, 1875.
Cotelerius, 'Patres Apostolici,' ed. J. Clericus. Amsterdam, 1724. 2 vols. folio.
Cowper, 'Apocryphal Gospels.' London, 1867.
Credner, 'Einleitung.' Halle, 1832.
Credner, 'Geschichte des Kanon.' Halle, 1847.

Davidson, 'Introduction to New Testament.' 2 vols.
Deichtal, 'Évangiles.' Paris, 1863.
Delitzsch, 'Apologetik.' Leipsic, 1869.
Delitzsch, 'Handwerkerleben z. Zeit Jesu.'
Derenbourg, 'Géographie de la Palestine.' Paris, 1867.
De Wette, 'Lehrbuch,' &c., 'des Neuen Testaments.' Berlin, 1860.
Döllinger, 'First Age of Church,' translated by Oxenham. London, 1866.
Dressel, 'Patres Apostolici.'

Ebrard, 'Kritik d. Evang. Geschichte.' Erlangen, 1850.

Fritzsche, 'Ev. Matthäi und Ev. Marci.' Leipsic, 1826.
Fritzsche, 'Libri Apocryphi.' Leipsic, 1871.

Gess, 'Lehre v. d. Person Christi.' Basel, 1856.

Gfrörer, 'Jahrhundert des Heils.' Stuttgart, 1838.
Gieseler, 'Evangelien.' Leipsic, 1818.
Godet, 'Études bibliques.' Paris, 1873, 1874.
Godet, 'On St. Luke.'
Grabe, 'Spicilegium.' Oxford, 1698. 2 vols.
Grau, 'Entwickelungsgeschichte.' Gütersloh, 1871. 2 vols.

Hartwig, 'Tabellen.' Berlin.
Hausrath, 'Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.' Heidelberg, 1873.
Herzog, 'Real-Cyclopädie.'
Hilgenfeld, 'Evangelien Justin's.' Halle, 1850.
Hilgenfeld, 'Evangelien.' Leipsic, 1854.
Hilgenfeld, 'Messias Judæorum,' Leipsic, 1869.
Hilgenfeld, 'Kanon.' Halle, 1863.
Hilgenfeld, 'Zeitschrift.' Various numbers.
Hoffmann, 'Leben Jesu.' Leipsic, 1851.
Holtzmann, 'Die Synoptischen Evangelien.' Leipsic, 1863.
Holtzmann, 'Judenthum u. Christenthum.' Leipsic, 1867.

Irenæus, ed. Stieren.

Jacobson, Bishop, 'Patres Apostolici.' Oxford, 1863.
Justin Martyr, ed. Otto.

Keil, 'Matthäus.' Leipsic, 1877.
Keim, 'Der Geschichtliche Christus.' Zurich, 1865.
Keim, 'Jesu von Nazara.' Zurich, 1871.
Kirchhofer, 'Quellensammlung.' Zurich, 1844.
Klostermann, 'Marcusevangelium.' Göttingen, 1867.
Kühn, 'Leben Jesu.' Mayence, 1838. 1st vol. only.
Kuinöl, 'New Testament.' Leipsic, 1817.

Lange, 'Bibelwerk.'
Lange, 'Leben Jesu.' Heidelberg, 1844.
Lardner's Works.
Lee, 'On Inspiration.' London, 1857.
Lewin, 'St. Paul.' London, 1875. 2 vols.
Lightfoot (Professor), "Review of Supernatural Religion," in the 'Contemporary Review.'

Maclellan, 'New Testament.' Vol. i.
Meyer, 'Matthäus, Markus und Lukas.' Göttingen.
Morrison, 'St. Matthew.' London, 1870.
Morrison, 'St. Mark.' London.
Munk, 'Palestine.' Paris, 1845.

Neander, 'Life of Christ.'
Nicolas, A., 'Divinité de Jésus-Christ.' Paris, 1864.
Nicolas, M., Études critiques.' Paris, 1864.
Nicolas, M., 'Évangiles apocryphes.' 1866.
Nicolas, 'Doctrines religieuses des Juifs.' Paris, 1867.

Oehler, 'Tertullian.' Leipsic, 1853.
Olshausen, 'Aechtheit,' &c.
Oosterzee, 'Bild Christi.' Hamburg, 1864.
Otto, 'Corpus Apologetarum.' Jena, various years. In this series Justin Martyr is included.

Peyrat, 'Histoire de Jésus.' Paris, 1664.
Pressensé, 'De Jésus-Christ.' Paris.

Renan, 'Évangiles.'
Renan, 'St. Paul.'
Renan, 'Vie de Jésus.'
Reuss, 'Théologie chrétienne.' Strasburg, 1860.
Reuss, 'Histoire du Canon.' Strasburg, 1863.
Réville, 'Matthieu.' Leyden, 1862.
'Revue de Théologie,' Strasburg. Various numbers.
Riggenbach, 'Life of the Lord Jesus.'
Ritschl, 'Evangelium Marcion's,' Tübingen, 1846.
Ritschl, 'Altkathol. Kirche.' Bonn, 1857.
Roberts, 'Discussions on Gospels,' London, 1862.
Rothe, 'Anfänge d. Christ. Kirche.' Wittenberg, 1837.
Rothe, 'Zur Dogmatik.' Gotha, 1863.
Rothe, 'Theologische Ethik.' Wittenberg, 1871.

Rougemont, 'Christ et ses Témoins.' Paris, 1856. 2 vols.
Row, 'Evidences.' Bampton Lectures, 1877.
Row, 'Supernatural in New Testament.'

Sabatier, 'Sources de la Vie de Jésus.' Paris, 1866.
Sanday, 'Gospels in Second Century.' London, 1876.
Schaff, 'Person of Christ.' New York, 1866.
Schenkel, 'Charakterbild Jesu.' Wiesbaden, 1864.
Schleiermacher, 'St. Luke.' Bishop Thirlwall's translation. London, 1825.
Schmid, 'Theologie d. N. Test.' Stuttgart, 1859.
Scholten, 'Das Aelteste Evangelium.' Elberfeld, 1869.
Schwarz, 'Geschichte d. N. Theologie.' Leipsic, 1856.
Sepp, 'Leben Christi.' Regensburg, 1843.
Sevin, 'Synoptische Erklärung.' Wiesbaden, 1873.
Smith (John), 'Select Discourses.' Cambridge, 1673.
Strauss, 'Christus des Glaubens,' &c. Berlin, 1865.
Strauss, 'Life of Jesus;' also 'New Life of Jesus.'
Stroud's 'Harmony of Gospels.' London, 1853.
'Supernatural Religion.' London, 1874. 2 vols.

Thiersch, 'Herstellung des Historischen Standpunkt.' Erlangen, 1845.
Tholuck, 'Das A. Test. im N. Testament.' Gotha, 1868.
Thomson, 'Land and Book.' London, 1861.
Tischendorf, 'Evangelia Apocrypha. Leipsic, 1853.
Tischendorf, 'Synopsis.' Leipsic, 1854.
Tischendorf, 'Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?' Leipsic, 1865.

Uhlhorn, 'Darstellungen des Lebens Jesu.' Hanover, 1866.

Voigt, 'Fundamentaldogmatik.' Gotha, 1874.
Volkmar, 'Evangelium Marcion's,' Leipsic, 1852.
Volkmar, 'Religion Jesu.' Leipsic, 1857.
Volkmar, 'Die Ursprung uns. Evangelien.' Zurich, 1866.
Volkmar, 'Marcus.' Second Edition. Zurich, 1876.

Weiss, 'Matthäusevangelium.' Halle, 1876.
Weiss, 'Marcusevangelium.' Berlin, 1872.
Weiszäcker, 'Evang. Geschichte.' Gotha, 1864.
Weisse, 'Evangelienfrage.' Leipsic, 1856.
Westcott, 'Introduction to Gospels.' London.
Westcott, 'History of New Testament Canon.' London.
Wichelhaus, 'Evangelium Matthäi.' Halle, 1876.
Wieseler, 'Chronologische Synopsis.' Hamburg, 1843. Also English translation by Venables.
Wieseler, 'Beiträge.' Gotha, 1869.
Winer, 'Realwörterbuch.' Leipsic, 1847.
Winer, 'Grammar of New Testament.' Translation. Edinburgh, 1861.
Wittichen, 'Leben Jesu.' Jena, 1876.

# TABLE OF THE HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

N.B.—In the following Table, where all the references under a given section are printed in thick type, as under "Two Genealogies," it is to be understood that some special difficulty besets the harmony. Where one or more references under a given section are in thin, and one or more in thick type, it is to be understood that the former are given as in their proper place, and that it is more or less doubtful whether the latter are to be considered as parallel narratives or not. It must always be remembered that the sacred writers have not so treated their subject that the construction of a complete Harmony is possible for us.

| | St. Matthew. | St. Mark. | St. Luke. | St. John. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| "The Word" .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | i. 1-14 |
| Preface, to Theophilus .. .. .. | . . | . . | i. 1-4 | |
| Annunciation of the Baptist's birth .. | . . | . . | i. 5-25 | |
| Annunciation of the birth of Jesus .. | . . | . . | i. 26-38 | |
| Mary visits Elizabeth .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | i. 39-56 | |
| Birth of John the Baptist .. .. .. | . . | . . | i. 57-80 | |
| Birth of Jesus Christ .. .. .. .. | i. 18-25 | . . | ii. 1-7 | |
| Two Genealogies .. .. .. .. .. | **i. 1-17** | . . | **iii. 23-38** | |
| The watching Shepherds .. .. .. | . . | . . | ii. 8-20 | |
| The Circumcision .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | ii. 21 | |
| Presentation in the Temple .. .. | . . | . . | ii. 22-38 | |
| The wise men from the East .. .. | ii. 1-12 | | | |
| Flight to Egypt .. .. .. .. .. .. | ii. 13-23 | . . | ii. 39 | |
| Disputing with the Doctors .. .. | . . | . . | ii. 40-52 | |
| Ministry of John the Baptist .. .. | iii. 1-12 | i. 1-8 | iii. 1-18 | i. 15-31 |
| Baptism of Jesus Christ .. .. .. | iii. 13-17 | i. 9-11 | iii. 21-22 | i. 32-34 |
| The Temptation .. .. .. .. .. . | iv. 1-11 | i. 12, 13 | iv. 1-13 | |
| Andrew and another see Jesus .. .. | . . | . . | . . | i. 35-40 |
| Simon, now Cephas .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | i. 41-42 |
| Philip and Nathanael .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | i. 43-51 |
| The water made wine .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | ii. 1-11 |
| Passover (1st) and cleansing the Temple | . . | . . | . . | ii. 12-22 |
| Nicodemus .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | ii. 23-iii. 21 |
| Christ and John baptizing .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | iii. 22-36 |
| The woman of Samaria .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | iv. 1-42 |
| John the Baptist in prison .. .. .. | iv. 12; xiv. 3 | i. 14; vi. 17 | iii. 19-20 | **iii. 24** |
| Return to Galilee .. .. .. .. | iv. 12 | i. 14, 15 | iv. 14, 15 | iv. 43-45 |
| The synagogue at Nazareth .. .. | . . | . . | iv. 16-30 | |
| The nobleman's son .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | iv. 46-54 |
| Capernaum. Four Apostles called .. | iv. 13-22 | i. 16-20 | **v. 1-11** | |
| Demoniac healed there .. .. .. | . . | i. 21-28 | iv. 31-37 | |
| Simon's wife's mother healed .. .. | viii. 14-17 | i. 29-34 | iv. 38-41 | |
| Circuit round Galilee .. .. .. .. | iv. 23-25 | i. 35-39 | iv. 42-44 | |
| Healing a leper .. .. .. .. .. .. | viii. 1-4 | i. 40-45 | v. 12-16 | |
| Christ stills the storm .. .. .. .. | viii. 18-27 | iv. 35-41 | viii. 22-25 | |
| Demoniacs in land of Gadarenes .. | viii. 28-34 | v. 1-20 | viii. 26-39 | |
| Jairus's daughter. Woman healed .. | ix. 18-26 | v. 21-43 | viii. 40-56 | |
| Blind men, and demoniac .. .. .. | ix. 27-34 | | | |
| Healing the paralytic .. .. .. .. | ix. 1-8 | ii. 1-12 | v. 17-26 | |
| Matthew the publican .. .. .. .. | ix. 9-13 | ii. 13-17 | v. 27-32 | |
| "Thy disciples fast not" .. .. .. | ix. 14-17 | ii. 18-22 | v. 33-39 | |
| Journey to Jerusalem to 2nd Passover | . . | . . | . . | v. 1 |
| Pool of Bethesda. Power of Christ .. | . . | . . | . . | v. 2-47 |
| Plucking ears of corn on Sabbath .. | xii. 1-8 | ii. 23-28 | vi. 1-5 | |
| The withered hand. Miracles .. .. | xii. 9-21 | iii. 1-12 | vi. 6-11 | |
| The Twelve Apostles .. .. .. .. | **x. 2-4** | iii. 13-19 | vi. 12-16 | |

| | St. Matthew. | St. Mark. | St. Luke. | St. John. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Sermon on the Mount | v. 1-vii. 29 | . . | vi. 17-49 | |
| The centurion's servant | viii. 5-13 | . . | vii. 1-10 | iv. 46-54 |
| The widow's son at Nain | . . | . . | vii. 11-17 | |
| Messengers from John | xi. 2-19 | . . | vii. 18-35 | |
| Woe to the cities of Galilee | xi. 20-24 | | | |
| Call to the meek and suffering | xi. 25-30 | | | |
| Anointing the feet of Jesus | . . | . . | vii. 36-50 | |
| Second circuit round Galilee | . . | . . | viii. 1-3 | |
| Parable of the Sower | xiii. 1-23 | iv. 1-20 | viii. 4-15 | |
| „ Candle under a Bushel | . . | iv. 21-25 | viii. 16-18 | |
| „ the Sower | . . | iv. 26-29 | | |
| „ the Wheat and Tares | xiii. 24-30 | | | |
| „ Grain of Mustard-seed | xiii. 31, 32 | iv. 30-32 | xiii. 18, 19 | |
| „ Leaven | xiii. 33 | . . | xiii. 20, 21 | |
| On teaching by parables | xiii. 34, 35 | iv. 33, 34 | | |
| Wheat and tares explained | xiii. 36-43 | | | |
| The treasure, the pearl, the net | xiii. 44-52 | | | |
| His mother and His brethren | xii. 46-50 | iii. 31-35 | viii. 19-21 | |
| Reception at Nazareth | xiii. 53-58 | vi. 1-6 | | |
| Third circuit round Galilee | ix. 35-38; xi. 1 | vi. 6 | | |
| Sending forth of the Twelve | x. | vi. 7-13 | ix. 1-6 | |
| Herod's opinion of Jesus | xiv. 1, 2 | vi. 14-16 | ix. 7-9 | |
| Death of John the Baptist | xiv. 3-12 | vi. 17-29 | | |
| Approach of Passover (3rd) | . . | . . | . . | vi. 4 |
| Feeding of the five thousand | xiv. 13-21 | vi. 30-44 | ix. 10-17 | vi. 1-15 |
| Walking on the sea | xiv. 22-33 | vi. 45-52 | . . | vi. 16-21 |
| Miracles in Gennesaret | xiv. 34-36 | vi. 53-56 | | |
| The bread of life | . . | . . | . . | vi. 22-65 |
| The washen hands | xv. 1-20 | vii. 1-23 | | |
| The Syrophœnician woman | xv. 21-28 | vii. 24-30 | | |
| Miracles of healing | xv. 29-31 | vii. 31-37 | | |
| Feeding of the four thousand | xv. 32-39 | viii. 1-9 | | |
| The sign from heaven | xvi. 1-4 | viii. 10-13 | | |
| The leaven of the Pharisees | xvi. 5-12 | viii. 14-21 | | |
| Blind man healed | . . | viii. 22-26 | | |
| Peter's profession of faith | xvi. 13-19 | viii. 27-29 | ix. 18-20 | vi. 66-71 |
| The Passion foretold | xvi. 20-28 | viii. 30-ix. 1 | ix. 21-27 | |
| The Transfiguration | xvii. 1-9 | ix. 2-10 | ix. 28-36 | |
| Elijah | xvii. 10-13 | ix. 11-13 | | |
| The lunatic healed | xvii. 14-21 | ix. 14-29 | ix. 37-42 | |
| The Passion again foretold | xvii. 22, 23 | ix. 30-32 | ix. 43-45 | |
| Fish caught for the tribute | xvii. 24-27 | | | |
| The little child | xviii. 1-5 | ix. 33-37 | ix. 46-48 | |
| One casting out devils | . . | ix. 38-41 | ix. 49, 50 | |
| Offences | xviii. 6-9 | ix. 42-48 | xvii. 2 | |
| The lost sheep | xviii. 10-14 | . . | xv. 4-7 | |
| Forgiveness of injuries | xviii. 15-17 | | | |
| Binding and loosing | xviii. 18-20 | | | |
| Forgiveness. Parable | xviii. 21-35 | | | |
| "Salted with fire" | . . | ix. 49, 50 | | |
| Journey to Jerusalem | . . | . . | ix. 51 | vii. 1-10 |
| Fire from heaven | . . | . . | ix. 52-56 | |
| Answers to disciples | viii. 19-22 | . . | ix. 57-62 | |
| The Seventy disciples | . . | . . | x. 1-16 | |
| Discussions at Feast of Tabernacles | . . | . . | . . | vii. 11-53 |
| Woman taken in adultery | . . | . . | . . | viii. 1-11 |
| Dispute with the Pharisees | . . | . . | . . | viii. 12-59 |
| The man born blind | . . | . . | . . | ix. 1-41 |
| The good Shepherd | . . | . . | . . | x. 1-21 |
| The return of the Seventy | . . | . . | x. 17-24 | |

| | St. Matthew. | St. Mark. | St. Luke. | St. John. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The good Samaritan .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | x. 25-37 | |
| Mary and Martha.. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | x. 38-42 | |
| The Lord's Prayer .. .. .. .. .. | vi. 9-13 | . . | xi. 1-4 | |
| Prayer effectual .. .. .. .. .. | vii. 7-11 | . . | xi. 5-13 | |
| "Through Beelzebub" .. .. .. | xii. 22-37 | iii. 20-30 | xi. 14-23 | |
| The unclean spirit returning .. .. | xii. 43-45 | . . | xi. 24-28 | |
| The sign of Jonah .. .. .. .. | xii. 38-42 | . . | xi. 29-32 | |
| The light of the body .. .. .. .. | v. 15; vi. 22, 23 | . . | xi. 33-36 | |
| The Pharisees .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxiii. | . . | xi. 37-54 | |
| What to fear .. .. .. .. .. .. | x. 26-33 | . . | xii. 1-12 | |
| "Master, speak to my brother".. .. | . . | . . | xii. 13-15 | |
| Covetousness .. .. .. .. .. .. | vi. 25-33 | . . | xii. 16-31 | |
| Watchfulness .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | xii. 32-59 | |
| Galileans that perished .. .. .. | . . | . . | xiii. 1-9 | |
| Woman healed on Sabbath.. .. .. | . . | . . | xiii. 10-17 | |
| The grain of mustard-seed .. .. .. | xiii. 31, 32 | iv. 30-32 | xiii. 18, 19 | |
| The leaven .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xiii. 33 | . . | xiii. 20, 21 | |
| Towards Jerusalem .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | xiii. 22 | |
| "Are there few that be saved?".. .. | . . | . . | xiii. 23-30 | |
| Warning against Herod .. .. .. | . . | . . | xiii. 31-33 | |
| "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem".. .. .. | xxiii. 37-39 | . . | xiii. 34, 35 | |
| Dropsy healed on Sabbath-day .. .. | . . | . . | xiv. 1-6 | |
| Choosing the chief rooms .. .. .. | . . | . . | xiv. 7-14 | |
| Parable of the Great Supper .. .. | xxii. 1-14 | . . | xiv. 15-24 | |
| Following Christ with the Cross .. | x. 37, 38 | . . | xiv. 25-35 | |
| Parables of Lost Sheep, Piece of Money, Prodigal Son, Unjust Steward, Rich Man and Lazarus .. .. | . . | . . | xv., xvi. | |
| Offences .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xviii. 6-15 | . . | xvii. 1-4 | |
| Faith and merit .. .. .. .. .. | xvii. 20 | . . | xvii. 5-10 | |
| The ten lepers .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | xvii. 11-19 | |
| How the kingdom cometh .. .. .. | . . | . . | xvii. 20-37 | |
| Parable of the Unjust Judge .. .. | . . | . . | xviii. 1-8 | |
| „ the Pharisee and Publican .. | . . | . . | xviii. 9-14 | |
| Divorce.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xix. 1-12 | x. 1-12 | | |
| Infants brought to Jesus .. .. .. | xix. 13-15 | x. 13-16 | xviii. 15-17 | |
| The rich man inquiring .. .. .. | xix. 16-26 | x. 17-27 | xviii. 18-27 | |
| Promises to the disciples .. .. .. | xix. 27-30 | x. 28-31 | xviii. 28-30 | |
| Labourers in the vineyard .. .. .. | xx. 1-16 | | | |
| Death of Christ foretold .. .. .. | xx. 17-19 | x. 32-34 | xviii. 31-34 | |
| Request of James and John .. .. | xx. 20-28 | x. 35-45 | | |
| Blind men at Jericho .. .. .. .. | xx. 29-34 | x. 46-52 | xviii. 35-43 | |
| Zacchæus .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | xix. 1-10 | |
| Parable of the Ten Talents .. .. | xxv. 14-30 | . . | xix. 11-28 | |
| Feast of Dedication .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | x. 22-39 |
| Beyond Jordan .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | x. 40-42 |
| Raising of Lazarus .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xi. 1-44 |
| Meeting of the Sanhedrim .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xi. 45-53 |
| Christ in Ephraim .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xi. 54-57 |
| The anointing by Mary .. .. .. | xxvi. 6-13 | xiv. 3-9 | vii. 36-50 | xii. 1-11 |
| Christ enters Jerusalem .. .. .. | xxi. 1-11 | xi. 1-10 | xix. 29-44 | xii. 12-19 |
| Cleansing of the Temple (2nd) .. .. | xxi. 12-16 | xi. 15-18 | xix. 45-48 | ii. 13-22 |
| The barren fig-tree .. .. .. .. | xxi. 17-22 | xi. 11-14, 19-23 | | |
| Pray, and forgive .. .. .. .. .. | vi. 14, 15 | xi. 24-26 | | |
| "By what authority," &c. .. .. .. | xxi. 23-27 | xi. 27-33 | xx. 1-8 | |
| Parable of the Two Sons .. .. .. | xxi. 28-32 | | | |
| „ „ Wicked Husbandmen | xxi. 33-46 | xii. 1-12 | xx. 9-19 | |
| „ „ Wedding Garment .. | xxii. 1-14 | . . | xiv. 16-24 | |

| | St. Matthew. | St. Mark. | St. Luke. | St. John. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The tribute-money .. .. .. .. .. | xxii. 15-22 | xii. 13-17 | xx. 20-26 | |
| The state of the risen .. .. .. .. | xxii. 23-33 | xii. 18-27 | xx. 27-40 | |
| The great Commandment .. .. .. | xxii. 34-40 | xii. 28-34 | | |
| David's Son and David's Lord .. .. | xxii. 41-46 | xii. 35-37 | xx. 41-44 | |
| Against the Pharisees .. .. .. .. | xxiii. 1-39 | xii. 38-40 | xx. 45-47 | |
| The widow's mite .. .. .. .. | . . | xii. 41-44 | xxi. 1-4 | |
| Christ's second coming .. .. .. | xxiv. 1-51 | xiii. 1-37 | xxi. 5-38 | |
| Parable of the Ten Virgins .. .. .. | xxv. 1-13 | | | |
| " " Talents .. .. .. .. .. | xxv. 14-30 | . . | xix. 11-28 | |
| The Last Judgment .. .. .. .. | xxv. 31-46 | | | |
| Greeks visit Jesus. Voice from heaven | . . | . . | . . | xii. 20-36 |
| Reflections of John .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xii. 36-50 |
| Last Passover (4th). Jews conspire .. | xxvi. 1-5 | xiv. 1, 2 | xxii. 1, 2 | |
| Judas Iscariot .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvi. 14-16 | xiv. 10, 11 | xxii. 3-6 | |
| Paschal Supper .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvi. 17-29 | xiv. 12-25 | xxii. 7-23 | xiii. 1-35 |
| Contention of the Apostles .. .. .. | . . | . . | xxii. 24-30 | |
| Peter's fall foretold .. .. .. .. .. | xxvi. 30-35 | xiv. 26-31 | xxii. 31-39 | xiii. 36-38 |
| Last discourse. The departure; the Comforter .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xiv. 1-31 |
| The vine and the branches. Abiding in love .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xv. 1-27 |
| Work of the Comforter in disciples .. | . . | . | . . | xvi. 1-33 |
| The prayer of Christ .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xvii. 1-26 |
| Gethsemane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvi. 36-46 | xiv. 32-42 | xxii. 40-46 | xviii. 1 |
| The betrayal .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvi. 47-56 | xiv. 43-52 | xxii. 47-53 | xviii. 2-11 |
| Before Annas (Caiaphas). Peter's denial .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvi. 57, 58, 69-75 | xiv. 53, 54, 66-72 | xxii. 54-62 | xviii. 12-27 |
| Before the Sanhedrim .. .. .. .. .. | xxvi. 59-68 | xiv. 55-65 | xxii. 63-71 | |
| Before Pilate .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvii. 1, 2, 11-14 | xv. 1-5 | xxiii. 1-3 | xviii. 28 |
| The Traitor's death .. .. .. .. .. | xxvii. 3-10 | | | |
| Before Herod .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | xxiii. 4-11 | |
| Accusation and Condemnation .. .. | xxvii. 15-26 | xv. 6-15 | xxiii. 13-25 | xviii. 29-40; xix. 1-16 |
| Treatment by the soldiers .. .. .. | xxvii. 27-31 | xv. 16-20 | xxiii. 36, 37 | xix. 2, 3 |
| The Crucifixion .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvii. 32-38 | xv. 21-28 | xxiii. 26-34 | xix. 17-24 |
| The mother of Jesus .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xix. 25-27 |
| Mockings and railings .. .. .. .. | xxvii. 39-44 | xv. 29-32 | xxiii. 35-39 | |
| The malefactor .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | xxiii. 40-43 | |
| The death .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvii. 50 | xv. 37 | xxiii. 46 | xix. 28-30 |
| Darkness and other portents .. .. | xxvii. 45-53 | xv. 33-38 | xxiii. 44, 45 | |
| The bystanders .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvii. 54-56 | xv. 39-41 | xxiii. 47-49 | |
| The side pierced .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xix. 31-37 |
| The burial .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | xxvii. 57-61 | xv. 42-47 | xxiii. 50-56 | xix. 38-42 |
| The guard of the sepulchre .. .. | xxvii. 62-66; xxviii. 11-15 | | | |
| The Resurrection .. .. .. .. .. | xxviii. 1-10 | xvi. 1-11 | xxiv. 1-12 | xx. 1-18 |
| Disciples going to Emmaus .. .. | . . | xvi. 12-13 | xxiv. 13-35 | |
| Appearances in Jerusalem .. .. .. | . . | xvi. 14-18 | xxiv. 36-49 | xx. 19-29 |
| At the Sea of Tiberias .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xxi. 1-23 |
| On the Mount in Galilee .. .. .. | xxviii. 16-20 | | | |
| Unrecorded Works .. .. .. .. .. | . . | . . | . . | xx. 30, 31; xxi. 24, 25 |
| Ascension .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | . . | xvi. 19, 20 | xxiv. 50-53 | |

# THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

# St. MATTHEW.

## CHAPTER I.

1 *The genealogy of Christ from Abraham to Joseph.* 18 *He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary when she was espoused to Joseph.* 19 *The angel satisfieth the misdeeming thoughts of Joseph, and interpreteth the names of Christ.*

THE book of the [a]generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.

2 [b]Abraham begat Isaac; and [c]Isaac begat Jacob; and [d]Jacob begat Judas and his brethren;

[a] Luke 3. 23.
[b] Gen. 21. 3.
[c] Gen. 25. 26.
[d] Gen. 29. 35.

---

CHAP. I.—1-18. THE GENEALOGY.

1. *The book of the generation.*] This expression has been variously interpreted: (1) as limited to the genealogical table; (2) as extending to the history of the birth and childhood of Jesus; (3) as embracing the whole Gospel, and meaning the history of the life of Jesus. The exact expression occurs in two places in the LXX, Gen. ii. 4, v. 1. In the former place, and perhaps in the latter also, it means the *history of the creation*, and so far confirms (2). The plural, *generations*, is often used of a genealogical table, but generally with reference to the ancestor, not to the descendant. Thus the "generation of Shem" means the table of the posterity descended from Shem. The authorities cited in support of the third interpretation are doubtful; and the choice seems to lie between the first and second.

But whichever of these interpretations may be adopted, there can be little doubt that the catalogue which follows is taken from an actual genealogical table, such as are known to have been kept among the Jews, both as public and as private records, until the destruction of Jerusalem. (See Lightfoot's Exerc. on this place, and compare 1 Chron. ix. 1; 2 Chron. xii. 15, xxxi. 16; Ezra ii. 59-62, viii. 1; Neh. vii. 5, 64, xii. 23.) The existence of such tables, by which any forgery could be easily detected, sufficiently refutes the theory of Strauss that the genealogies were invented by the Evangelists to make out a royal descent for our Lord. The untenability of this theory is shown at length in Dr. Mill's 'Observations,' part II. chap. ii.

The name *Messiah* was sometimes used to denote a priest (Levit. iv. 3, vi. 22; Numb. iii. 3), afterwards more frequently a king (1 Sam. xvi. 6, xxiv. 6, xxvi. 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam. i. 16, xix. 21; Isai. xlv. 1), perhaps also a prophet (1 Kings xix. 16); but after the prophecy of Daniel, ix. 25, was applied especially to the Prince there promised, the expected Messiah.

*of Jesus Christ.*] Both the sacred names are here used as proper names, as in verses 16, 17, 18, and in Mark i. 1, John i. 17, as well as frequently in the Acts, and generally in the Epistles. Elsewhere in the Gospels the name *Christ* is a name not of the Person, but of the office, answering to the Hebrew *Messiah, anointed.* (Meyer.)

*the son of David, the son of Abraham.*] In these words is manifested the purpose of the first Evangelist, to portray the Lord as the Messiah of the Jews, in whom were fulfilled the promises made to Abraham and David. This is one of the evidences that St. Matthew's Gospel was written in the first instance for Jewish Christians.

2. *Abraham begat Isaac.*] The first part of this genealogy from Abraham to David, as well as the corresponding portion of that in St. Luke, is taken directly from the Old Testament (Ruth iv. 18-22; 1 Chron. ii. 3-15); and questions concerning this portion may be most properly considered in connection with the original places. The difficulties proper to the New Testament belong entirely to the latter portion of the genealogies, and arise principally from a comparison of St. Matthew with St. Luke, and of both with the corresponding notices in the Old Testament, as represented in the following tables:—

[e] Gen. 38. 27. [f] Ruth 4. 18. 1 Chron. 2. 5.

3 And [e] Judas begat Phares and Zara of Thamar; and [f] Phares begat Esrom; and Esrom begat Aram;

4 And Aram begat Aminadab; and Aminadab begat Naasson; and Naasson begat Salmon;

| St. Matthew. | St. Luke. | Old Testament. |
|---|---|---|
| Solomon. | Nathan. | |
| Roboam. | Mattatha. | |
| Abia. | Menan. | |
| Asa. | Melea. | |
| Josaphat. | Eliakim. | |
| Joram. | Joram. | |
| —— | Joseph. | Three kings come between Joram and Ozias, omitted in St. Matthew's list, viz., Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah. |
| —— | Juda. | |
| —— | Simeon. | |
| Ozias. | Levi. | |
| Joatham. | Matthat. | |
| Achaz. | Jorim. | |
| Ezekias. | Elezer. | |
| Manasses. | Jose. | |
| Amon. | Er. | |
| Josias. | Elmodam. | |
| —— | Cosam. | Jehoiakim is the son, Jehoiachin (also called Jeconiah and Coniah) the grandson of Josiah. |
| Jechonias. | Addi. | |
| *Salathiel.* | Melchi. | Salathiel, son of Jeconiah, in 1 Chron. iii. 17. |
| *Zorobabel.* | Neri. | Zorobabel is called the son of Shealtiel in Ezra iii. 8; Nehem. xii. 1; Hagg. i. 1, 12, 14; but in 1 Chron. iii. 19, of Pedaiah. |
| Abiud. | *Salathiel.* | |
| Eliakim. | *Zerobabel.* | Seven sons and at least two grandsons of Zerubbabel are named, 1 Chron. iii. 19, 20, but the names do not correspond with either Evangelist. |
| Azór. | Rhesa. | |
| Sadoc. | Joanna. | |
| Achim. | Juda. | |
| Eliud. | Joseph. | |
| Eleazar. | Semei. | |
| Matthan. | Mattathias. | |
| Jacob. | Maath. | |
| Joseph. | Nagge. | |
| | Esli. | |
| | Naum. | |
| | Amos. | |
| | Mattathias. | |
| | Joseph. | |
| | Janna. | |
| | Melchi. | |
| | Levi. | |
| | Matthat. | |
| | Heli. | |
| | Joseph. | |

St. Matthew's list after Zorobabel contains nine names less than St. Luke's, which makes it probable that in this as in the previous division, some names have been omitted to reduce the number to fourteen. A more serious difficulty is occasioned by the want of correspondence in the names actually given, but it should be observed that this very discrepancy is incompatible with the supposition of a mythical or forged genealogy. The compiler of such a genealogy would have attempted to give his fiction an air of probability, by making it correspond as far as possible with the Old Testament records, whereas St. Matthew's list differs from the Chronicles in the two names following Zorobabel, and St. Luke adopts an independent line from David downwards, introducing, however, Salathiel and Zorobabel under a different descent. These discrepancies can only be explained on the supposition that the Evangelist followed independent documents. A comparison with the Chronicles may most properly be made in connection with the more complete list of St. Luke. In the present place it will be proper to consider the variations between the two Evangelists, and the mode in which they may be accounted for. Three principal schemes of reconciliation may be mentioned:—

I. That which supposes that St. Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph, St. Luke that of Mary. This view does not appear to have been distinctly maintained before the end of the 15th century, but has in modern times been adopted by many eminent commentators, chiefly among Protestants.

Against this theory it may be urged: (1) that it contradicts the plain words of the Evangelists, who ascribe both genealogies to Joseph; (2) that it leaves unexplained the similar difficulty with regard to the parentage of Salathiel: it seems absurd to suppose, as some have done, that "Son of Heli" means "son-in-law." (3) That it is opposed to the general testimony of antiquity, though so simple as to have suggested itself from the first, had there been sufficient grounds for adopting it.

II. That which supposes both genealogies to be those of Joseph, and accounts for his double parentage by the supposition of a levirate marriage; Jacob and Heli being sons of the same mother by different fathers; the latter being the legal father of Joseph, the former his real father by marriage with half-brother's widow. This view is founded on a tradition recorded by Julius Africanus in the third century, as derived from the Desposyni or kinsmen of our Lord. It is generally adopted in substance by those of the fathers and early commentators who have treated of the subject down to the end of the 15th century.

The principal objections against this theory are: (1) that Africanus himself reports the tradition with some doubt of its value; (2) that it is, to say the least, extremely questionable, whether the law of levirate marriages applied to merely uterine brothers; (3) that, like the former scheme, it leaves unexplained the double parentage of Salathiel; (4) that the account itself has an artificial appearance; (5) that it is improbable that two separate genealogies should have been constructed, the one for the real and the other for the legal parent. The case of Booz and Obed makes

5 And Salmon begat Booz of Rachab; and Booz begat Obed of Ruth; and Obed begat Jesse;

6 And [g] Jesse begat David the king; and [h] David the king begat Solomon of her *that had been the wife* of Urias;

7 And [i] Solomon begat Roboam; and Roboam begat Abia; and Abia begat Asa;

8 And Asa begat Josaphat; and Josaphat begat Joram; and Joram begat Ozias;

9 And Ozias begat Joatham; and Joatham begat Achaz; and Achaz begat Ezekias;

[g] 1 Sam. 16. 1 & 17. 12.
[h] 2 Sam. 12. 24.
[i] 1 Chron. 3. 10.

---

it probable that the former alone would be adopted.

III. That which supposes that St. Matthew intends to give the table of royal succession or heirship to the throne of David, while St. Luke gives that of actual descent. If this hypothesis be carried through the tables we must suppose that the royal line through Solomon became extinct in Jeconias when the right of succession passed to the collateral line of Nathan in Salathiel; and again that the elder branch of Zorobabel's posterity became extinct in Eleazar or in Jacob (see below on verse 15), when the succession passed to the younger branch in Matthan or in Joseph the son of Heli. This view is maintained in part by Grotius and Possinus, and recently by Dr. Mill, and is carried out more fully by Lord Arthur Hervey.

This scheme seems in itself by far the most natural that has been proposed, and is supported by at least two remarkable coincidences with the Old Testament: the childlessness of Jeconiah predicted by Jeremiah xxii. 30, and the mention of the "family of the house of Nathan" by Zechariah xii. 12 in a manner which seems to indicate the then principal branch of the house of David. Against it, it may be urged that the word *begat* has to be used in an improper sense, for descent by adoption as well as by natnral generation. But it may perhaps be replied that if this word were the one ordinarily in use for the construction of a genealogy on a descending scale, it would naturally be retained in each link, even if the family were continued by adoption; and that a break of this sort might very probably occur in a descending genealogy like that of St. Matthew, but not in an ascending genealogy like that of St. Luke. Moreover, the case of Zorobabel and perhaps that of Hezekiah (see below on verses 9, 12) are at least probable instances of this use of the term.

5. *Rachab.*] The marriage of Salmon with Rahab is not mentioned in the Old Testament. Its mention here shows that the Evangelist must have had access to independent sources of information.

6. *the wife of Urias.*] Several ingenious conjectures have been hazarded by various commentators as to the reason why these four women, Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba have been especially selected for mention in the genealogy (see Meyer on verse 3). Perhaps after all the simple reason is to be found in the fact that these are the only four women in the series (after Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah, who are too well known to need mention) of whom there is any special narrative in the Old Testament. (Weiss, 'Matthæusevangelium,' 1876, observes, "these women are expressly mentioned because they became ancestresses of the Messiah in an extraordinary manner, and were therefore types or figures (*Vorbilder*) of Mary." F. C. C.)

8. *Joram begat Ozias.*] Three kings are here omitted, viz. Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah. The most probable reason of this omission on the part of the Evangelist is that these names were previously omitted in the document from which his genealogy was taken. That such omissions were not unusual in Jewish genealogies is shown by Dr. Mill, who adduces a remarkable parallel from a Samaritan poem. In like manner several generations are omitted in the genealogy of Ezra, Ezra vii. 1-5, compared with 1 Chron. vi. 3-15. The omission was probably made for the sake of symmetry in the table, to make the same number of generations in the first and in the second period. Why these particular names were selected for omission is mere matter of conjecture; but it may be observed that these three kings all died by violence, and that one of them, Joash, was not buried in the sepulchres of the kings (2 Chron. xxiv. 25). The conjecture that the omission is due to the similarity between the Greek names of Ahaziah and Uzziah (Ochozias and Ozias) proceeds on the assumption that not only the gospel of St. Matthew but the documents from which his genealogy was taken, were both written in Greek.

9. *Achaz begat Ezekias.*] It may be conjectured that Hezekiah was not the real but only the adoptive son of Ahaz; and if so this is an instance in which the word *begat* is not to be understood literally. Ahaz died at the age of thirty-six (2 Kings xvi. 2; 2 Chron. xxviii. 1). The LXX version of 2 Chron.

k 2 Kin. 20. 21. 1 Chron. 3. 13.

10 k And Ezekias begat Manasses; and Manasses begat Amon; and Amon begat Josias;

1 Some read, *Josias begat Jakim, and Jakim begat Jechonias.*

11 And 1 Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon:

12 And after they were brought to Babylon, l Jechonias begat Salathiel; and Salathiel begat Zorobabel;

l 1 Chron 3. 16, 17.

13 And Zorobabel begat Abiud; and Abiud begat Eliakim; and Eliakim begat Azor;

---

xxviii. 1 (Vat. The Alex. text has υἱὸς εἴκοσι ἐτῶν) makes Ahaz twenty-five when he began to reign, but even the Vatican LXX at 2 Kings xvi. 2, retains the number twenty, and the reading εἴκοσι καὶ πέντε may have been copied erroneously from the beginning of chap. xxvii., or may have been a correction to avoid the chronological difficulty; and Hezekiah succeeded him at the age of twenty-five (2 Kings xviii. 2; 2 Chron. xxix. 1). Unless, therefore, there is some error in the numbers, Ahaz was but eleven years older than Hezekiah. There is some ground to conjecture that Ahaz died childless, and that Hezekiah, the next in succession, was adopted as his heir. For Ahaz is said to have burnt his son (or his children) in the fire (2 Kings xvi. 3; 2 Chron. xxviii. 3). And Isaiah, "in the year that king Ahaz died," represents Palestina (*i.e.* the Philistines) as vainly rejoicing because the rod of him that smote her was broken (Isa. xiv. 28, 29). The smiter of Palestine seems to mean Uzziah, whose victories over the Philistines are mentioned 2 Chron. xxvi. 6; and by the breaking of her rod, it seems to be implied that the direct line of Uzziah's successors was in some manner interrupted by the death of Ahaz. The prophet predicts that, notwithstanding this interruption, another conqueror of the Philistines should arise from the root or family of Uzziah, which prediction was fulfilled by Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 8) (*Possinus*). (See Dr. Kay on Isaiah, p. 126. He explains the rod to mean Assyria, but observes that the Targum and most commentators refer it to the house of David. F. C. C.)

11. *Jechonias and his brethren.*] It may be questioned whether by this first Jechonias is intended Jehoiakim or Jehoiachin. In behalf of the former it may be urged: (1) that he was the actual son of Josiah; (2) that he is known to have had brethren, two of whom became kings, which is probably the reason of their being mentioned here; (3) that a second Jechonias, different from the first, is needed to complete the last fourteen generations. On behalf of the latter it may be urged: (1) that the name Jechonias is never in scripture given to Jehoiakim, but always to Jehoiachin, being in fact the same name with the elements transposed (1 Chron. iii. 16; Jer. xxiv. 1, xxvii. 20, xxviii. 4; Esther ii. 6); (2) that the time of the captivity agrees more nearly with the birth of Jehoiachin than with that of Jehoiakim; (3) that the second Jechonias is certainly Jehoiachin, and there is no hint in the text of the two being different persons. The latter grounds seem on the whole the stronger, supposing that there is no corruption in the text. Jehoiakim seems to have been omitted from the genealogy, and it may be noted that he, like Joash, was not buried among the kings, but cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem (Jer. xxii. 19, xxxvi. 30). Jeconias is Jehoiachin, the grandson of Josiah, reckoned as his son in the genealogy. By the brethren of Jeconias are probably meant his uncles, Jehoahaz and Zedekiah, both of whom became kings. It may be observed that Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin are figuratively regarded as brothers, under the image of two whelps of the same lioness, in Ezek. xix., and that Zedekiah seems to be regarded as the son of Jehoiakim (or Jehoiachin) in 1 Chron. iii. 16, and is called the brother of Jehoiachin, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10. It may be observed also that the time they were carried away into Babylon is not a single year, but a period extending from the third year of Jehoiakim's reign to the final captivity under Zedekiah.

It is possible, however, that the present text may not represent the original as written by the Evangelist. For Irenæus, 'C. Hæres.' iii. 21, seems to have read the names both of Jehoiakim and Jeconiah in his copy, "Joseph enim Joachin et Jeconiæ filius ostenditur, quemadmodum et Matthæus generationem ejus exponit." The inference, however, from this passage is too uncertain to be insisted upon.

12. *Jechonias begat Salathiel.*] In this case, as in that of Ahaz and Hezekiah, there are distinct reasons in the Old Testament for supposing that the word *begat* is not to be taken literally. (See above on verse 2 with the references to Jer. xxii. 30, and Zech. xii. 12.) It is probable that the line of Solomon became extinct in Jehoiachin, and that Salathiel the son of Neri, of the house of Nathan, was adopted as the son of Jehoiachin and the successor to his regal rights. This succession, supposing the line of Solomon to be extinct, would be according to the law of such cases (Numb. xxvii. 8-11).

*Salathiel begat Zorobabel.*] In making Zorobabel the son of Salathiel or Shealtiel, the Evangelist follows the majority of Old

14 And Azor begat Sadoc; and Sadoc begat Achim; and Achim begat Eliud;

15 And Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob;

16 And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

17 So all the generations from Abraham to David *are* fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon *are* fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ *are* fourteen generations.

18 ¶ Now the [m] birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as

[m] Luke i. 27.

---

Testament authorities (see Ezra iii. 2, 8, v. 2; Neh. xii. 1; Haggai i. 1, 12, ii. 2). In one passage (1 Chron. iii. 19) Zorobabel is mentioned as the son of Pedaiah, the brother of Salathiel. The most probable explanation of this discrepancy is to suppose that Zorobabel was actually the son of Pedaiah, but the heir, and by adoption the son, of his uncle Salathiel.

**13–15.** After Zorobabel, the two lines again seem to diverge, the line of royal inheritance being traced through Abiud to Jacob, and that of natural descent through Rhesa to Heli. The probability is that the elder branch of Zorobabel's descendants became extinct in Eleazar or in Jacob, and that the succession passed to the younger branch in Matthat, or in Joseph. But it is doubtful whether the divergence of the two branches begins directly after Zorobabel, or at a later period. It is possible that some of the earlier names in the two series may be really identical, though apparently different. It is possible that Abiud may, as Lord A. Hervey conjectures, be identical with the Juda of St. Luke, and with the Hodaiah of 1 Chron. iii. 24, and that Joanna, whose name precedes Juda in St. Luke's list, may be the Hananiah of 1 Chron. iii. 19. But whether we accept these conjectures or not, it is clear that the lines diverge somewhere below Zorobabel and meet again in Matthan or in Joseph.

**15.** *Matthan.*] It is probable, both from the position and from the similarity of name, that this Matthan is the same as the Matthat of St. Luke. If so, it is in his person that the royal succession passed from the elder to the younger branch of Zorobabel's descendants, and Jacob and Heli are his two sons.

**16.** *Joseph the husband of Mary.*] Joseph according to St. Matthew is the son of Jacob; according to St. Luke, of Heli. This discrepancy on a point which must have been easily ascertainable at the time when these Gospels were written, can hardly be explained except on the supposition that it is intentional, and arises from the different principles on which the two genealogies were constructed. According to the mode of interpretation which we have throughout adopted, the most probable explanation will be that Joseph was the son of Heli by birth, but the heir and adopted son of Jacob. If, moreover, we suppose Jacob and Heli to have been brothers, it is almost certain, according to the Jewish custom in such cases, that if Jacob had a daughter, she would become the wife of his nephew Joseph. (See Numb. xxxvi. 11; 1 Chron. xxiii. 22; Tobit iii. 15, 17, vi. 10–12.) Thus there is at least a high probability that the Gospel genealogies contain not merely the nominal lineage of our Lord, through His reputed father, but also His actual lineage through His Virgin mother as the daughter of Jacob, though neither genealogy is expressly constructed for the latter purpose. That Mary as well as Joseph was descended from David seems implied in Luke i. 32.

**17.** *fourteen generations.*] If Jechonias be reckoned only once, as concluding the series before the captivity, we have only thirteen generations in the last series, from Salathiel to our Lord, both included. But the natural interpretation of the Evangelist's language seems to be that fourteen names are mentioned after the captivity; and thus Jechonias is reckoned twice; first as regards his birth before the captivity, and secondly as regards his paternity, whether natural or by adoption, after that event. There is no similar reason for repeating a name at the end of the first series, as David's life is not broken by any event. Thus, then, the first fourteen names are from Abraham to David inclusive; the second fourteen from Solomon to Jechonias, the latter being included in respect of his birth before the captivity; the third fourteen from Jechonias regarded as becoming a father after the captivity, to our Lord.

These periods are of unequal lengths, and it is remarkable that the shortest of the three is the one from which we know that some generations are omitted. From the birth of Abraham to that of Solomon, which commences the second series, includes, according to the ordinary chronology, a period of about 963 years, and has by some eminent authorities been extended to upwards of 1050 years more; while from the birth of Solomon to that of Jechoniah (Jehoiachin) is about 416

his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.

19 Then Joseph her husband, being a just *man*, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily.

20 But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.

21 [n] And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.

[n] Luke i. 31.

22 Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,

23 [o] Behold, a virgin shall be with

[o] Isai. 7. 14.

---

years; and from Jechoniah to Christ about 617 years. In the middle period, if we supply the four omitted kings, we have in St. Matthew's list seventeen full generations, beginning with Solomon and including Jehoiakim, who was grown up at the time of the captivity. This will give an average of between twenty-four and twenty-five years to a generation, while the fourteen full generations, from Abraham to the birth of Solomon give an average, on the lowest calculation, from sixty-seven to sixty-eight years, which may, perhaps, be extended to nearly eighty years. This estimate during the early part of the period, accords with what we know of the history of the Patriarchs; but there is some difficulty in the chronology of the later period, from the settlement in Egypt to the birth of Solomon.

18–25. THE BIRTH OF OUR LORD.

**18.** *she was found.*] The following events must be placed in order of time, after the return of Mary from her visit to Elisabeth (Luke i. 56). From a comparison of the two narratives, it is natural to infer that Mary immediately after the Annunciation, went to visit Elisabeth, without communicating to Joseph the angelic visit and its purport. It shows the shifts to which rationalistic criticism is sometimes reduced, that this circumstance has been used as an argument against the historical truth of the two narratives, as if she who received the wonderful announcement with the words: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word," would not be content to leave the future to God, to be made known at His own time, and in His own way.

*of the Holy Ghost.*] It has been providentially ordered, that the two Evangelists who record our Lord's genealogy through His legal father Joseph, are also the two who expressly mention His miraculous conception through the Holy Ghost. (Cf. Luke i. 35.) Yet in the face of this fact certain rationalist commentators assure us that the genealogy through Joseph *must* have arisen from a primitive belief in the natural generation of our Lord as Joseph's son. The answer is very simple. We have nothing to do with what must be according to modern canons of criticism, but with what is according to the evidence of facts. The Evangelists themselves are the best evidence of the primitive belief associated with these genealogies, and they expressly give them in conjunction with the record of the miraculous conception.

**19.** *a just man.*] As just, Joseph could not complete his marriage, but he was also unwilling to make her a public example; he therefore, resolved on a middle course. The word rendered "make a public example," occurs also in Hebr. vi. 6, where it is rendered "put to an open shame," with reference to the public shame of crucifixion. Joseph, therefore, might satisfy his own duty by a dismissal, probably with a bill of divorcement, as the law (Deut. xxiv. 21) applied to betrothed as well as to married persons.

**20.** *thy wife.*] Mary is here called *wife*, as Joseph is called *husband*, because betrothed persons were regarded by the law as husband and wife (See Deut. xxii. 24).

**21.** JESUS.] The Greek form of the name Joshua, and used of Joshua in two places of the New Testament, Acts vii. 45; Hebr. iv. 8. The name signifies the *Salvation of Jehovah* or *Jehovah the Saviour*, differing, as Bengel observes, from the original name Hoshea, by the addition of the Divine Name. It is in fact interpreted in the words that follow, "He shall save," literally, "He Himself shall save." "Joshua," says Bishop Pearson, "saved Israel not by his own power, not of himself, but God by him; neither saved he his own people, but the people of God: whereas, Jesus Himself by His own power, the power of God, shall save His own people, the people of God." Well, therefore, may we understand the interpretation of his name to be *God the Saviour*.

*from their sins.*] Thus early and clearly is the spiritual nature of Christ's salvation

child, and shall bring forth a son, and [1]they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.

[1] Or, *his name shall be called.*

24 Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife:

25 And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.

# CHAPTER II.

1 *The wise men out of the east are directed to Christ by a star.* 11 *They worship him, and offer their presents.* 14 *Joseph fleeth into Egypt, with Jesus and his mother.* 16 *Herod slayeth the children:* 20 *himself dieth.* 23 *Christ is brought back again into Galilee to Nazareth.*

NOW when [a]Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judæa in the days of Herod the king, behold, there

[a] Luke 2. 6.

---

declared, in opposition to the current expectations of a temporal Deliverer.

**23.** *Behold .... Emmanuel.*] This citation is almost verbatim from the LXX, the rendering "a virgin," more correctly "**the virgin**," showing clearly the sense attached to the word by the interpreters, at a time, when there were no dogmatic inducements to a different rendering. The passage, however, in Isaiah should be translated in the present tense, "Behold a virgin is with child and beareth a son," implying that she is a virgin at the time of the pregnancy. The future birth of the Messiah is beheld in the prophetic vision as already present, and the overthrow of the hostile kingdoms is predicted at a time calculated from it. (See note by Dr. Kay *in loc.* F. C. C.) This prophecy seems to be directly Messianic, and the attempt to give it a primary application to the time of Ahaz, involves some altogether gratuitous assumptions. The name Immanuel occurs a second time in Isai. viii. 8, and the mention of *his land* seems to preclude the possibility of any son of the prophet being intended, while there is no one of the royal house to whom it can apply, Hezekiah having been born some years before the delivery of the prediction. The utmost that can be said is, that a second sign of the overthrow of the hostile kingdoms is given in the birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz; who, in this respect, but in no other, may be considered as resembling the predicted Immanuel; and even this resemblance is reduced considerably if we translate the words of Isaiah, vii. 16, as some distinguished commentators have done, not "the land which thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings," but, "the land, of whose two kings thou art afraid, shall be forsaken." Immanuel is not to be understood as a proper name, but as an appellative, describing the character of the Child to be born of the Virgin. In like manner in Isai. ix. 6, it is said "*His name shall be called* Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God," &c. The Evangelist in citing the prophecy continues the line of thought already implied in the name Jesus. The Child thus marvellously born, who Himself, by His own divine power shall save His people from their sins, is, as the prophet foretold, God with us.

**25.** *her firstborn.*] Or, "a son," so the two oldest MSS and late critical editions. F. C. C.

CHAP. II.—1-15. THE VISIT OF THE MAGI.

**1.** *Bethlehem.*] *I. e.* "House of Bread," called Bethlehem of Judea, to distinguish it from Bethlehem in Galilee.

*in the days of Herod the king.*] Herod died just before the passover, A.U.C. 750. The probable date of our Lord's birth is a few months before Herod's death, either towards the end of A.U.C. 749, or just at the beginning of 750, *i.e.* in B.C. 5, or B.C. 4 of the vulgar era, which erroneously places our Lord's birth A.U.C. 754. Wieseler decides the month to be December, January, or February, with a probability in favour of the last; but this latest date allows only two months from our Lord's birth to Herod's death, which is barely sufficient for the intervening events. The earlier dates, January, B.C. 4, or December, B.C. 5, seem on the whole more probable. (On the date of Herod's death see Ideler, ii. 389-393; Wieseler, 'Chron. Syn.' 50-57; Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' p. 125; Schürer, 'Lehrb. der Neutest. Zeitgeschichte,' § 15, 16. He died shortly after an eclipse of the moon (see Joseph. 'Ant.' xvii. 6, 4). The eclipse took place 750 A.U.C. on the night between the 12th and 13th of March. There was no lunar eclipse in Palestine in the two following years. F. C. C.)

*there came wise men.*] The visit of the Magi must almost certainly be placed subsequent to the presentation in the temple, and, therefore, more than forty days after our Lord's birth. The narrative of this chapter will thus come in after the 38th verse of the 2nd chapter of St. Luke, and before the return to Nazareth, mentioned in the 39th verse, which is probably the same as that recorded at the end of the present chapter. The sojourn in Egypt was probably very short, ending immediately after the death of Herod, and is wholly unconnected with the

came wise men from the east to Jerusalem,

2 Saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him.

3 When Herod the king had heard *these things*, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.

4 And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born.

5 And they said unto him, In

---

series of events recorded by St. Luke; which may account for its omission by that Evangelist in his very brief record of our Lord's infancy.

*from the east.*] Nothing is said in the Gospel of the number of the Magi, nor of the part of the East from which they came. The tradition which makes them three in number seems to have arisen only from the threefold gift; and that which makes them kings and their country Arabia, from a literal interpretation of Ps. lxxii. 10; Isai. lx. 3. The country was more probably Persia, or the adjacent region which was the chief seat of the Magian religion. (Cf. Hyde, 'De Rel. Persarum,' c. 31, p. 283, ed. 2; Mill on Pantheism, Part II. p. 364; Greswell 'Diss.' ii. p. 137, Ellicott, 'Lectures,' p. 71.) It is possible that the intercourse between the Jews and Persians during the captivity, or the subsequent residence of Jews of the dispersion in that country ("Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites"—Acts ii. 9), may have made the Magi acquainted with Hebrew prophecies of the Messiah, supported to some extent by their own traditions; but the narrative seems to imply the concurrence also of a special revelation to themselves, interpreting the sign and directing their subsequent conduct. Such a revelation is certainly supposed in verse 12.

It is remarkable that this account of the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles should be found only in that Evangelist who wrote especially for the Jews, and who brings forward most prominently the character of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. This circumstance is an evidence of the historical truth of the narrative; and militates against the view of those who regard it as a myth significant of the reign of Christ over the Gentiles.

**2.** *for we have seen his star.*] Some writers, following Kepler, attempt to identify the star of the Magi with a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, which took place three times in A.U.C. 747. This view is adopted by Ideler and Wieseler, who, however, deduce from it different conclusions as to the year of our Lord's birth. But it has recently been shown, that the appearance presented by this conjunction would by no means answer the conditions required by St. Matthew's description. The natural interpretation of the text clearly implies a supernatural appearance of a meteoric character, and not a star in the ordinary sense of the term. (See the article "Star of the Wise Men" by Mr. Pritchard, in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' and compare Mill on Pantheism, Part II. p. 369, *seq.*, and Bishop Ellicott, 'Lectures,' p. 72.)

*in the east.*] Some interpreters render this expression "at its rising;" but the ordinary translation seems supported by verse 9, in which the place where they had seen the star is distinguished from the place where the young child was. (See Ellicott, 'Lectures,' p. 93.)

**4.** *the chief priests and scribes of the people.*] With this expression may be compared ch. xvi. 21, "the elders and chief priests, and scribes;" ch. xxi. 23, xxvi. 47, xxvii. 1, "the chief priests and the elders of the people;" ch. xxvi. 3, "the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people;" ch. xxvi. 59, "the chief priests, and elders, and all the council." These various expressions seem intended to designate the whole or a portion of the Sanhedrim or Council. This body consisted of seventy-one, or, as some say, of seventy-two members, divided into three classes. (1) *Chief priests* (see note on ch. xxvii. 1. F. C. C.) (2) *Scribes* or *Lawyers*, chosen from among those learned in the Jewish Law. (3) *Elders*, men of age and reputation among the people. The expression here used, *scribes of the people*, occurs 1 Macc. v. 42, and the elders are called *elders of the people*, ch. xxi. 23, xxvi. 3, xxvii. 1, whence it has been supposed that these two classes represent the non-sacerdotal element of the Sanhedrim, or at any rate those who did not sit as priests. (Cf. Lightfoot and Bengel here.) This council was probably formed in imitation of the body of seventy elders appointed to assist Moses, (Numb. xi. 16); but this body appears to have been only temporary, and the actual institution of the Sanhedrim is probably subsequent to the captivity. The Greek origin of the name *Sanhedrim* (συνέδριον) points to a period subsequent to the Macedonian supremacy in Palestine, and the earliest historical evidence of its existence seems to be found in the *council* or *senate* mentioned 2 Macc. i. 10, iv. 44, xi. 27. On this account its origin has, with some probability, been referred to

Bethlehem of Judæa: for thus it is written by the prophet,

g Mic. 5. 2. John 7. 42.

6 g And thou Bethlehem, *in* the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall 1 rule my people Israel.

1 Or, *feed*.

7 Then Herod, when he had privily called the wise men, enquired of them diligently what time the star appeared.

8 And he sent them to Bethlehem, and said, Go and search diligently for the young child; and when ye have found *him*, bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also.

9 When they had heard the king, they departed; and, lo, the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was.

10 When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.

11 ¶ And when they were come

---

the time of the Maccabees. The expression in the text may be an abbreviated description of the whole Sanhedrim; but it is possible that Herod on this occasion may have consulted only the priests and scribes as forming the theological elements of the council.

(The first express mention of the Sanhedrim is found in Josephus, 'Antiq.' xiv. 9, § 4. M. Derenbourg says: "Il n'est certes pas antérieur au temps des Simonéens." It was then called the Beth-din—house of judgment. He considers that it was organised by John Hyrcanus when he separated himself from the Pharisees. —See 'Histoire de la Palestine,' pp. 86, 87. This work gives the fullest and best account of the institution. N.B. The form Sanhedrin is more accurate, but Sanhedrim has been retained throughout this Commentary as being generally used. F. C. C.)

6. *And thou Bethlehem.*] These words are the citation of the Sanhedrim in their answer to Herod: and the passage is important, as showing that the authorised expositors of the Jewish Scriptures were in the habit of citing them by paraphrase, and not literally. The citation differs both from the original, and from the LXX in the following points: (1) "Bethlehem, land of Judah," for "Bethlehem Ephratah;" (2) "art not the least," for "though thou be little;" (3) "princes" for "thousands;" (4) the transposition of the words "that shall rule" (feed), which in Micah come in the 4th verse, "and he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord." Of these it may be observed, that the first is probably only the substitution of the better known name of the place, Bethlehem-Judah, for Bethlehem-Ephratah, that the second brings out what is implied though not asserted in the original, the smallness of Bethlehem in size, being contrasted with its greatness in dignity. (Cf. Hooker, 'E.P.' v. 19, § 3.) With regard to the third, it has been noted that the same word, according to the vowel points supplied, may be rendered "thousands" or "princes;" the name being given to the prince or governor, as the head of the family or "thousand." (Cf. Judges vi. 15, where *my family* is, in the LXX "my thousand.") The fourth cites a portion of Mic. v. 4, in its logical connection, omitting the latter part of verse 2, and the parenthetical verse 3. The language is thus substantially accurate as an explanatory paraphrase, though not a literal quotation.

Both the question of Herod, and the answer of the priests and scribes, imply that the birthplace of the Messiah is foretold in Scripture. Here, then, we have clearly the original interpretation of the prophecy, before any dogmatic prejudice suggested a different meaning. And it is difficult to believe that any other sense would ever have been put upon the words, had it not been suggested by the wish to explain away the reference to Jesus as the Messiah. Accordingly some of the later Jewish Rabbis, followed by some modern critics, have endeavoured to set aside this natural interpretation, and to maintain that the words mean, not that Christ should be born at Bethlehem, but only that he should be descended from David. But Bethlehem was not in this sense *little* when Micah wrote; it had already been dignified by the birth of David, and (on this interpretation) of all the subsequent kings of Judah also. It is Bethlehem the place, not the family of David, that is little among the thousands of Judah; therefore it is Bethlehem the place, not the family of David, that is here spoken of as giving birth to the Messiah. If the Messiah is to come from Bethlehem only because he is the descendant of David, he may equally be said to come from Ur of the Chaldees, or from Hebron, because he is descended from Abraham and Isaac. For a full refutation of this interpretation see Mill on Pantheism, Part II. p. 391, *seq.*; Hengstenberg, 'Christology,' vol. i. p. 475, *seq.* Eng. Tr.

7. *enquired . . . diligently.*] Rather, "ascertained exactly."

9. *lo, the star, &c.*] These words seem to imply that the star had not been visible,

into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down, and worshipped him: and when they had opened their treasures, they [1]presented unto him gifts; gold, and frankincense, and myrrh.

[1] Or, *offered*.

12 And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way.

13 And when they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him.

14 When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt:

15 And was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, [a]Out of Egypt have I called my son.

[a] Hos. 11. 1.

16 ¶ Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under,

---

during their journey from the east, but now reappeared on their way from Jerusalem to Bethlehem.

*stood over where the young child was.*] *I.e.* over the house, as implied by verse 11; not merely over the village of Bethlehem. On this phenomenon Mr. Pritchard (art. "Star of the Wise Men," in Smith's 'Dict.') remarks: "arrived on the hill and in the village, it became physically impossible for the star (*i.e.* the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, supposed by Kepler and others to be the star) to stand over any house whatever close to them, seeing it was now visible far away beyond the hill to the west, and far off in the heavens at an altitude of 57°. As they advanced, the star would of necessity recede, and under no circumstances could it be said to stand 'over' any house, unless at the distance of miles from the place where they were . . . A star, if vertical, would appear to stand over any house or object to which a spectator might chance to be near; but a star at an altitude of 57° could appear to stand over no house or object in the immediate neighbourhood of the observer . . . Thus the beautiful phantasm of Kepler and Ideler, which has fascinated so many writers, vanishes before the more perfect daylight of investigation."

15. *Out of Egypt, &c.*] This passage is cited according to the original. The LXX have instead of *my son*, *his children*. The words as used by Hosea, have no doubt a primary reference to the Exodus, and probably to the words of the Lord to Moses (Exod. iv. 22, 23), "Thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my firstborn; and I say unto thee, Let my son go." Yet the LXX translators, who know nothing of the typical sense of the passage, seem to have felt that there was some strangeness in the expression *my son*, used simply of the people of Israel, which they have avoided in their translation of both passages. Yet how significant does this strange language become, when understood, as the Evangelist cites it, as having a further prophetic reference to the Infant Saviour, of whom the "child Israel" is the type! It is not necessary to suppose that this further meaning was present to the mind of the prophet; it is sufficient if we believe that it was in the mind of the Holy Ghost who spake by the Prophets.

16–18. Murder of the Children.

16. *from two years old.*] A child of thirteen months old would be considered, according to the Jewish reckoning, as of two years (see Greswell, 'Diss.' ii. p. 136). But it is not necessary to suppose that our Lord had attained that age at this time. According to the reckoning adopted above (see on verse 1) His birth may probably be placed about three months, more or less, before Herod's death. If we suppose the star to have first appeared, not at the time of His birth, but of His Annunciation, which will allow full time for the journey of the wise men, and if, as seems also probable, we suppose the murder of the Innocents to have been one of the last acts of Herod's life, nearly twelve months would have elapsed from the first appearance of the star. It is possible, however, that Herod may have supposed the star to indicate the time of the birth; and it is at least certain that a man of his ferocious disposition would not hesitate to take the widest possible range of time, in order to accomplish his purpose more effectually.

This indiscriminate slaughter is quite consistent with Herod's uniform policy of destroying all rival claimants to the throne, and with the reckless thirst for blood exhibited

according to the time which he had diligently enquired of the wise men.

17 Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by [b]Jeremy the prophet, saying,

[b] Jer. 31. 15.

18 In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping *for* her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.

19 ¶ But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt,

20 Saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel: for they are dead which sought the young child's life.

21 And he arose, and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Israel.

22 But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judæa in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither: notwithstanding, being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee:

---

by him at the close of his life. A striking sketch of his character and conduct in these respects is given by Dr. Mill, 'Observations,' Part II. pp. 330-340. The only plausible ground on which the truth of the evangelical narrative has been questioned, is the silence of profane history concerning it. But the only historian who could have been expected to mention it is Josephus, and Josephus (unless we except the disputed passage, 'Antiq.' xviii. 3, § 3) seems to have systematically omitted all mention of the origin and progress of Christianity. To this it may be added, that in so small a place as Bethlehem, the number of children of that age was probably not large, and the deed might be passed over among the atrocities of Herod's latter days. Without attaching much weight to the testimony of Macrobius ('Satur.' ii. 4), we may at least assert that it is of as much value on the positive side as the silence of Josephus on the negative. But the real evidence in favour of the narrative is of another kind. (See next note.)

**17.** *Then was fulfilled, &c.*] In this passage, as in the previous citation from Hosea, there is a primary reference to a past event, which only acquires a further significance when read by the light of the subsequent antitype. There is no doubt that the words as originally spoken by Jeremiah related in the first instance to the captivity of Judah and Benjamin in his own day; Rachel, the mother of the latter patriarch, being represented as weeping at Ramah (where the captives were assembled, Jer. xl. 1), over her children carried into captivity. But this very circumstance furnishes a proof of the historical truth of the evangelical narrative. The double sense of the prophecy is declared by the same Holy Spirit by whom it was originally inspired; but to a human expositor there is nothing in the image of Rachel weeping in Ramah of Benjamin, to suggest a massacre of children at Bethlehem of Judah; the only connecting link being the situation of her sepulchre near the latter place. No reason can be assigned why the Evangelist, in defiance of history, should have invented this charge against one so well known as Herod, except the supposition that it was suggested by the necessity of finding a fulfilment for Jeremiah's prophecy. But the words of Jeremiah had apparently received their fulfilment already; and there is nothing in them to suggest the necessity of a further fulfilment until they are read by the light of subsequent events. Setting aside for the moment the question of inspiration, and regarding the Evangelist merely as a human writer, as the unbelieving hypothesis requires, there is no conceivable reason why the story of the massacre should have been invented to suit the prophecy: on the contrary, it is only on the supposition that the massacre was already known as a historical fact that it could possibly have suggested a further fulfilment of the prophecy. Thus even on its own assumption, the mythical hypothesis reasons in a circle. The narrative is invented to suit a supposed meaning of the prophecy: the prophecy could only have been supposed to have that meaning in consequence of the fact being as narrated.

19–23. FROM EGYPT TO GALILEE.

**22.** *Archelaus.*] On the death of Herod, his dominions were divided by Augustus, according to his testament, among three of his sons. Archelaus, under the title of *Ethnarch*, had Judæa, Idumæa, and Samaria; Antipas had Galilee and Peræa; and Philip, Trachonitis (with Ituræa), Batanæa, and Auranitis. Both these had the title of *Tetrarch* (cf. Joseph. 'Antiq.' xvii. 11. 4, with Luke iii. 1). The statement in the text is quite in accordance with the character of Archelaus, who resembled his father in disposition, and whose cruelties finally led to his banishment to Vienne in Gaul, in the tenth year of his reign.

23 And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene.

---

(See Josephus, 'Antiq.' xvii. 11, § 2; 13, § 2.)

*to go thither.*] It has been maintained by some critics that there is a discrepancy here between St. Matthew and St. Luke; the former supposing Bethlehem, and not Nazareth, to have been the original dwelling-place of our Lord's parents. We are not warranted in assuming *à priori* that an inspired writer cannot have been ignorant of circumstances which he was not commissioned to narrate: it is sufficient if there is no discrepancy in the matter actually narrated, and no such discrepancy between the two Evangelists can be found here. But it may be observed that the language which St. Matthew uses is not that which we should have expected had he supposed Bethlehem to have been Joseph's ordinary residence. He does not say that Joseph feared to *return* to Judæa, but that he feared to *go*, or rather to *depart* (ἀπελθεῖν) thither, words which more naturally suggest the choice of a new residence than a mere return home. Compare ch. iv. 13, where it is said that Jesus, leaving Nazareth, *came* (ἐλθὼν) and dwelt in Capernaum. It was very natural that the wonderful events which had taken place at Bethlehem, and its dignity as the city of David, should point it out as apparently the fittest place of residence for the Son of David, and suggest to our Lord's parents a design of settling there in preference to the despised Nazareth. This point is ably treated by Wieseler, 'Chronol. Synopsis,' pp. 30-37, Eng. Tr.

*notwithstanding.*] This word has no equivalent in the original, which merely says, "And being warned," &c.

*turned aside.*] Literally *withdrew*, or *retired*, *i.e.* into the comparative obscurity of Galilee. The same word is used of our Lord's withdrawal into Galilee in ch. iv. 12. In like manner His brethren speak of His ministry in Galilee as *in secret* (John vii. 4). The word is sometimes rendered *returned*; but this sense cannot be insisted on here. It is used above, verse 12, of the return of the Magi to their own country; but it is used again in verse 14 of the withdrawal into Egypt.

23. *He shall be called a Nazarene.*] These words are not found literally in any prophecy of the Old Testament. But it should be observed that St. Matthew does not say, as in other cases, *by the prophet*, but *by the prophets*, thus intimating that he is not giving the actual words of any one prediction, but the general sense of many. Yet it is probable that the Evangelist had especially in his mind one particular prophecy, which in reality approaches far nearer to the citation than at first sight it seems to do. The city of Nazareth is nowhere mentioned in the Old Testament nor in the Talmud, so that we are left to conjecture as regards the Hebrew form of its name; but Hengstenberg ('Christol.' ii. p. 106, E. Tr.) has shown with considerable probability that the original name was *Netser* (נצר), and this view is accepted as proved by Winer (R.W.B. v. Nazareth). The name of the city is thus identical with that given to the Messiah in Isaiah xi. 1, as the *branch* or *shoot* of the roots of Jesse. The name also has probably the same meaning in both cases, being given to the town on account of its smallness and insignificance, as a weak shoot in contrast to a stately tree (a meaning which perhaps gives the point of the saying of Nathanael, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?"), while it was applied to the Messiah with reference to the lowliness of his first appearance as "a slender twig shooting out from the trunk of an old tree, cut down, lopped to the very root, and decayed." (Bishop Lowth on Isai. xi. 1.) Compare the similar language of Isai. liii. 2; Ezek. xvii. 22. Our Lord, by His residence at Nazareth, thus verbally as well as really fulfilled the prediction of the prophet; not only growing up in obscurity from the family of Jesse reduced to a low estate, but bearing a name derived from the place in which He grew up, which in its derivation expressed this circumstance. With this principal prophecy are perhaps secondarily connected others, such as the two cited above, which express a similar thought, though in different language. The other prophecies in which our Lord is spoken of as the Branch (Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12) may also be indirectly referred to, though in these also the word used is different, and has no connection with the name of Nazareth. On the other hand, the marginal references to the Nazarites Samson and Samuel (Judg. xiii. 5; 1 Sam. i. 11) are quite irrelevant, both in name and in reality. In name the two words Nazarene and Nazarite are wholly unconnected with each other; and, in fact, our Lord was not vowed as a Nazarite, but in this respect is expressly contrasted with his precursor John the Baptist. (Cf. Luke i. 15, vii. 33, 34.)

## CHAPTER III.

*1 John preacheth: his office: life, and baptism. 7 He reprehendeth the Pharisees, 13 and baptizeth Christ in Jordan.*

[c Mark 1. Luke 3. 2.]

IN those days came [c] John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judæa,

2 And saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

[d Isai. 40. Mark 1. 3.]

3 For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, [d] The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

4 And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey.

5 Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan,

6 And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.

---

CHAP. III.—1–12. THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

1. *In those days.*] I.e. during the time that our Lord dwelt at Nazareth. The remainder of His early life is passed over, and the Evangelist proceeds at once to the period of His ministry as ushered in by the preaching of John the Baptist. So in Exodus (ii. 11) a similar expression is used in the same latitude with regard to Moses.

*came John the Baptist.*] In the original, *comes*. The Evangelist has made no previous mention of John, but he now introduces him as a person well known to his readers.

*in the wilderness of Judæa.*] By the term *wilderness* is not to be understood a sandy desert, but an uncultivated district, though at certain times abounding in vegetation, and used for pasturage. A very unnecessary difficulty has been made by supposing St. Matthew's "Wilderness of Judea" to mean the same as the "Wilderness of Judah" (Judges i. 16) which lay to the S.W. of the mouth of the Jordan, along the border of the Dead Sea. But St. Matthew is speaking generally of the wilderness country of the province of Judea, without confining himself to that portion of it which lay within the old limits of the tribe of Judah. The country to the north of the wilderness of Judah proper, as far as Jericho, was also wilderness (Joshua xvi. 1), and the banks of the lower Jordan were of the same character (Josephus 'B. J.' iii. 10. 7, iv. 10. 4). The whole of this district may be fairly included in St. Matthew's expression; while St. Luke (iii. 3), who speaks of the Baptist as coming from the wilderness into the country about Jordan, probably referred to the wilderness of Judah proper. Yet St. Luke, as well as St. Matthew, reports our Lord's words in which the scene of the Baptist's ministry is called "the wilderness" (Matt. xi. 7; Luke vii. 24).

2. *the kingdom of heaven.*] This expression is peculiar to St. Matthew, though the other Evangelists frequently use the synonymous expression the *kingdom of God*. It properly signifies the promised kingdom of the Messiah, and though not literally found in the Old Testament, would be naturally suggested by passages in which that kingdom is described, such as Ps. ii. 6, cx. 2, and especially Dan. ii. 44, vii. 14. Hence the expectation of the Messiah is spoken of as a "waiting for the kingdom of God" (Mark xv. 43; Luke xxiii. 51; compare Luke xvii. 20, xix. 11). Our Lord adopts the expression and frequently employs it to denote His Spiritual Kingdom the Church. (Cf. Pusey's 'Lectures on Daniel,' p. 82.)

3. *For this is he.*] It seems most natural to regard these words as a citation by St. Matthew himself, though some regard them as a continuation of the words of the Baptist as in John i. 23, where he applies the prophecy to himself.

*The voice of one crying, &c.*] Cited from the LXX. This passage is supposed to have a primary reference to the return of the Jews from captivity, and to be only secondarily fulfilled in the preaching of the Baptist. If this interpretation be admitted it will only be another instance of the double sense of prophecy, similar to those in ch. ii. 15, 18. But in the present passage, the spiritual signification so completely eclipses the temporal as to make it approach very nearly to a directly Messianic prophecy, like Isai. vii. 14 in relation to ch. i. 23.

4. *had his raiment, &c.*] Compare the description of his prototype Elijah, 2 Kings i. 8. The rough garment of hair was characteristic of a prophet, Zech. xiii. 4.

*locusts.*] In Leviticus xi. 22 the locust is expressly mentioned as allowable for food. The Arabs eat them to this day, but they are generally regarded as an inferior kind of food used only by the poor. (Cf. Thomson, 'The Land and the Book,' p. 419.) There can be no doubt that this insect is intended.

6. *And were baptized of him.*] Concerning the origin of the baptism of John we learn

7 ¶ But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, [a] O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

[a] ch. 12. 34.

---

from Scripture: (1) that it was instituted by the express command of God (John i. 33); (2) that in the form in which it was administered it was regarded as an extraordinary rite which ought not to be administered without a special prophetic mission (John i. 25). Yet the question of the Pharisees seems to imply that the external form at least of the rite was one with which they were already familiar; and it is in itself most probable that the sign selected would be one which already had a meaning for the people to whom it was addressed. It may be questioned, however, whether this meaning is to be found in the custom of *baptizing proselytes*, a custom which, at least in its most important features, probably belongs to a later age, and which is nowhere commanded in the Old Testament. It seems more natural to refer to the symbolical washings by way of purification which were required by law (Exod. xix. 10, xxx. 20; Levit. xiv. 9, xv. 13, xxii. 6; Numb. xix. 7, 13), with the prophetic use of the same image, to denote spiritual purification (Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Isai. i. 16). See below, note on Proselytes, at the end of ch. xxiii. (Some MSS insert "river" before Jordan. F.C.C.)

7. *the Pharisees and Sadducees.*] Concerning the origin and distinctive features of these two bodies, there is considerable obscurity and controversy. In Scripture they appear as religious sects or rather *parties* (Acts xxvi. 5) while Josephus adapting his language to heathen readers, speaks of them as *philosophies*, or sects of philosophy ('Ant.' xviii. 1, § 2; 'B.J.' ii. 8, § 2). In this point of view the distinguishing tenets noted in Scripture are: (1) "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both" (Acts xxiii. 8). (2) The Pharisees held "the tradition of the elders" (Mark vii. 3), *i.e.* a system of unwritten precepts, the principal of which they held to have been given to Moses, on Mount Sinai, along with the written law; while the Sadducees acknowledged only the authority of the written law, *i.e.* of the canonical Scriptures, not, as has sometimes been thought, of the Pentateuch alone. (Cf. Jos. 'Ant.' xiii. 10, § 6, who, however, uses the expression "in the law of Moses.") It is probable, however, that the opposition between these parties was originally more political than religious, and that their dogmatic differences were partly the consequence of their political antagonism. The earliest historical notice of these parties speaks of them as existing in the days of Jonathan, the Asmonæan high priest B.C. 159-144 (Joseph. 'Ant.' xiii. 5, § 9), but it is probable that they were the gradual product of circumstances whose germ may be traced almost to the time of the return from the captivity. The re-establishment of the Jews in Palestine naturally gave rise to two courses of policy; one which sought to continue, and even to increase, the ancient separation between the Jews and the heathen kingdoms with which they came in contact; the other which sought to facilitate intercourse by partial assimilation (1 Macc. i. 11-13). From the former gradually arose the Pharisees, whose name almost certainly means "the separate" (Epiphan. 'Hær.' 16, 1); from the other the Sadducees, the origin of whose name is more doubtful, being sometimes referred to an individual Zadok, sometimes interpreted as meaning the party of *righteousness*, *i.e.* mere literal conformity to the law (Epiphan. 'Hær.' 14). The former, in their desire to increase the line of demarcation between Jew and Gentile, would naturally claim a divine authority for all peculiar customs and traditions; the latter would reject every thing but the written law, and probably adopt a lax interpretation even of that; the former would cherish Messianic expectations and look forward to the great restoration of their nation, with which hope was intimately associated the belief in the resurrection (Dan. xii. 2); the latter would be led to regard such hopes as visionary, and to confine themselves to a worldly policy for worldly purposes. These differences would naturally reach their climax in the days of foreign persecution, and of the forcible attempt to introduce heathen practices. Hence it is probable that the Pharisees were regarded as successors of the Assideans (Chasidim, *Saints*) mentioned 1 Macc. ii. 42, vii. 13; 2 Macc. xiv. 6.

*to his baptism.*] They seem to have come merely as part of the crowd from curiosity rather than any higher motives, and, as may be inferred from Luke vii. 30, to have departed without receiving baptism. This marks them out from the rest of the crowd, to whom also the Baptist's words were partly addressed (Luke iii. 7), but on whom they produced a different effect. This coming of the Pharisees and Sadducees to John must be different from the mission of the former to him mentioned by St. John i. 24. The latter must have taken place, not only after our Lord's baptism, but after His Temptation, (see on ch. iv. 1), while the events of the present text are placed before the Baptism both by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

8 Bring forth therefore fruits [1] meet for repentance:

9 And think not to say within yourselves, [f] We have Abraham to *our* father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

10 And now also, the ax is laid unto the root of the trees: [g] therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

11 [h] I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire:

12 Whose fan *is* in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

13 ¶ [i] Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him.

14 But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?

15 And Jesus answering said unto

[1] Or, *answerable to amendment of life.*
[f] John 8. 39.
[g] ch. 7. 19.
[h] Mark 1. 8. Luke 3. 16. John 1. 26.
[i] Mark 1. 9. Luke 3. 21.

---

*generation of vipers.*] An expression probably borrowed from the language of Isaiah lix. 5.

*the wrath to come.*] The coming of the Messiah was expected to be a time of judgment (Dan. vii. 10, 26), which, however, the Jews interpreted of the heathen only. The Baptist warns them of the wrath of God against all unrepentant sinners, whether Jews or Gentiles.

**9.** *children unto Abraham.*] Children in faith, instead of in blood. (Cf. Rom. iv. 12-16; Gal. iii. 29.)

**11.** *I indeed baptize you with water, &c.*] These words, or similar ones, seem to have been uttered by the Baptist on more than one occasion. St. John (i. 26) records them as part of the reply to the messengers of the Pharisees. In the other three Evangelists they appear as if spoken before our Lord's baptism. But the notes of time in the synoptical narratives are not so decided as to make this inference necessary. It is possible, though less probable, that the other Evangelists may have grouped together succinctly and without reference to the order of time, sayings which St. John gives with more circumstantiality.

*whose shoes I am not worthy to bear.*] In St. Luke iii. 16, "the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose." Both are equivalent expressions, meaning "whose servant I am not worthy to be." (See note on Mark i. 7. F. C. C.)

*with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.*] A manifest prophetic reference in the first instance to the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, as may be seen from our Lord's own words to the Apostles, Acts i. 5. Compare also the account of the Ephesian disciples, Acts xix. 2-6. There is also a secondary reference to the contrast between the baptism of John and Christian baptism in general, the former being a call to repentance, but not a means of conveying spiritual grace. Yet, notwithstanding this obvious reference, some commentators have preferred to interpret the words as referring to a double baptism, of some with the Holy Ghost, of others with the fire of punishment. Of this double baptism the text says nothing: it rather suggests a contrast between the baptism of John and that of Christ, each regarded as one.

13–17. THE BAPTISM OF JOHN.

**13.** *Then cometh Jesus.*] The question has been asked, why should Jesus the Sinless One submit to the baptism of repentance? Many of the conjectures which have been hazarded in answer are excluded by the words of our Lord Himself, that it was done "to fulfil all righteousness." We have only to inquire what is the meaning of this expression. It can scarcely mean to fulfil "the requirements of the law;" for there is no evidence that the law enjoined a baptism like that of John, though it employed the external form in some ceremonial acts. It seems rather to mean, to do the whole will of God, in relation to Christ's human nature and office. (Cf. Psalm xl. 8.) He who sent John to baptize with water, sent him with the purpose that Christ should partake of that baptism, and Christ comes to fulfil that purpose. In His baptism, as in His sufferings, He was made to be sin for us, who knew no sin. It is possible that the baptism may have had a further signification as a consecration of our Lord to His mediatorial office, as the priests under the law were consecrated by washing (Exod. xxix. 4, xl. 12).

**14.** *John forbad him, &c.*] John appears from this passage to have had some knowledge of Jesus, yet he is elsewhere represented as saying, "I knew him not," (John i. 31, 33). The latter expression certainly means "I knew

him, Suffer *it to be so* now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him.

16 And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him:

17 And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

---

Him not as the Messiah" (as in verse 26, "there standeth one among you whom ye know not"), and does not necessarily imply that John had no acquaintance with the person of Jesus. It is quite possible, however, that the latter may have been the case, notwithstanding the relationship between them; for John's earlier life was chiefly passed "in the deserts" (Luke i. 80). Leaving this point, however, as the Scripture leaves it, undecided, the words of St. Matthew imply no more than that John, whether previously acquainted or not with the person of Jesus, recognised Him on His approach (whether by natural insight or by supernatural intimation), as one holier than himself. He knew beforehand that the Messiah was to come to him (John i. 33): he may have felt that that promise was now about to be fulfilled, but he could not certainly know it till he saw the promised sign of the descending Spirit.

15. *now.*] Rather *as yet*. The time had not yet come for the manifestation of Jesus, though it was at hand.

16. *he saw, &c.*] It seems more natural to understand Jesus, not John, as the subject of this sentence (for a similar use of *him* for *himself* see John i. 48; Eph. i. 17). It must be inferred, however, from John i. 33, that the same sight was seen by the Baptist also. Whether it was seen by anyone else is not directly stated, but the natural inference from the two narratives seems to be that the appearance and the voice were manifested to our Lord and the Baptist only. They may have been alone at the time; or if not, we have an instance in Acts ix. 7 of such an appearance being confined to one person while the others present were unconscious of it. (Alford.)

*like a dove.*] *I. e.* "in bodily shape like a dove" (Luke iii. 22). This seems to be the natural meaning of the passage; and nothing is gained by attempting any less literal interpretation. The whole narrative implies, not indeed necessarily that the Holy Spirit actually assumed the form of a dove, but at least that a visible form, like the cloven tongues as of fire on the day of Pentecost, appeared as the token and evidence of the Holy Spirit's descent. Thus much being granted, it is more natural to suppose that the actual appearance seen was that of a dove than that it was some unknown form descending after the manner of a dove.

17. "*This is my beloved Son.*"] In Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22, the words are given in the second person, "Thou art my beloved Son." This is one of the earliest of those cases (of which the inscription on the Cross and the words used at the institution of the Lord's Supper are favourite instances) in which the words used on a given occasion are reported with a slight verbal difference by different Evangelists. Such variations might be found in different human histories of the same event, without any impeachment of the veracity of the writers; nay, rather with additional confirmation as showing their independence of each other in the form of their report along with coincidence in its substance. Nor is there any real reason why such variations should not be found in inspired writings. They only show that the Holy Spirit, when condescending to act on human minds and through human language, did not deprive His instruments of those human characteristics which win confidence and mark veracity in other cases. There is nothing more marvellous in this, than in the general fact that God condescends to speak through man at all. It is part of the miracle of inspiration, but it does not add to it. Whatever good reasons there may be why God should communicate a revelation to man through men, there will be the same reason why He should leave them in possession of their human claims to the confidence of mankind while preserving them from substantial error in delivering the message entrusted to them.

Date of our Lord's Baptism.—This event is placed by Wieseler in the spring or summer of A.U.C. 780. Bishop Ellicott places it later, in the winter of the same year. But if we place our Lord's birth at the end of A.U.C. 749 or the very beginning of 750 (see on ch. ii. 1), He had completed His 30th year in January 780, and the probable date of the Baptism will be in the beginning of that year. The Passover of John ii. 13 will thus be that of 780, not that of 781. The tradition which places our Lord's Baptism as well as His Birth in the beginning of January seems worthy of consideration (see Ellicott, 'Lect.' p. 104), and with this date there will be suf-

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *Christ fasteth, and is tempted.* 11 *The angels minister unto him.* 13 *He dwelleth in Capernaum,* 17 *beginneth to preach,* 18 *calleth Peter, and Andrew,* 21 *James, and John,* 23 *and healeth all the diseased.*

THEN was [a] Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil.

[a] Mark 1. 12. Luke 4. 1

2 And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred.

---

ficient time for the subsequent events down to the Passover of the same year. (See note on ch. iv. 1, and cf. Greswell's 'Dissertations,' i. 37, Abp. Thomson in Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' i. 1074, and note on Mark i. 10.)

CHAP. IV.—1-11. THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS.

Before proceeding to the details of this narrative, it should be remarked at the outset that there is only one way of understanding it as a whole: viz., as the history of a real occurrence, of an actual temptation of our Lord by the devil as a person. Such a history it is clearly the intention of the Evangelist to give; and the only difficulty which this interpretation has peculiar to itself is that it presupposes two things, which are also supposed throughout the rest of Scripture: the possibility of the supernatural, and the personality of the Tempter. If either of these is denied, the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith must necessarily fall with them. To deny the supernatural is to deny what is asserted in every page of the Gospels; and to deny the personality of the Tempter is virtually to assert that the temptation was suggested from within, not from without—an assertion incompatible with the perfect sinlessness of Christ, and with all the edifice of Christian truth, of which that sinlessness is the foundation. The naturalistic explanations, such as that which supposes the tempter to have been a man, or the whole scene to have taken place in a dream or a trance, are contrary to the whole tenor of the narrative. But in admitting the history of the temptation as a narrative of facts, it does not follow that we are bound to assign a reason for those facts, or to explain why they were permitted to take place in the manner narrated. We know that Christ from the very beginning was promised to man as the antagonist of Satan: we know that His mission throughout is a conflict with the powers of darkness: but we know too little of the counsels of God or the wiles of Satan to explain why the temptation should have been designed and permitted in this particular form rather than in others. We may be sure, however, that the spirit which raises objections on this ground would have been equally ready with similar objections had any other mode of temptation been narrated instead.

1. *of the spirit.*] *I.e.* by the Holy Ghost. St. Mark says, "the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness." The language of St. Luke (iv. 1) should be literally translated "was led *in* the Spirit;"—an expression which by itself might be compatible with the supposition of a vision (cf. Rev. i. 10); but which cannot be so understood consistently with the tenor of the narrative and with the language of the other Evangelists.

St. Mark distinctly places the Temptation *immediately* after the Baptism. Hence the events recorded by St. John i. 19-51 must be placed after the Temptation; and we must suppose that our Lord returned from the wilderness to Bethabara (or rather Bethany) beyond Jordan, and there again met the Baptist. The events between our Lord's Baptism and the first Passover of His ministry will thus be arranged as follows: (1) the Temptation; (2) the events recorded in John i. 19-51; (3) the first journey into Galilee, and the marriage at Cana; (4) the visit to Capernaum; (5) the return to Jerusalem for the Passover. These events would probably occupy about seventy days or a little more (see Clinton, 'Fast. Rom.' ii. 234), and could at all events be concluded before the Passover of 780, which fell on April 9th (Greswell, 'Diss.' i. 332), (or that of 782, which fell on April 16th; see Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' p. 177).

*into the wilderness.*] The scene assigned by tradition to our Lord's Temptation is the wilderness of Quarantania, formerly called the wilderness of Jericho (Josh. xvi. 1). The mountain of Quarantania to the N. of Jericho in particular is the traditional place of the third temptation. (See Robinson, 'Palestine,' ii. 552.)

*to be tempted of the devil.*] Strauss rejects the narrative of the temptation on the ground that *there is no devil*, and that the belief in his existence was borrowed by the Jews from the Persians. For a refutation of the theory that the belief in angels, good and evil, was derived from the Persians, see Dr. Pusey's 'Lectures on Daniel,' p. 525, *seq.* But in the present place we are concerned only with the belief in a personal tempter, whose existence is clearly asserted in the beginning of the book of Job, and as clearly implied in the narrative of the Fall.

2. *forty days and forty nights.*] As did Moses (Exod. xxxiv. 28) and Elijah (1 Kings xix. 8). From these types, as well as from the language of St. Luke iv. 2, it is manifest that

3 And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.

4 But he answered and said, It is written, [l]Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

[l] Deut. 8. 3.

5 Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple,

6 And saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, [m]He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in *their* hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.

[m] Ps. 91. 11.

7 Jesus said unto him, It is written again, [n]Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

[n] Deut. 6. 16.

8 Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them;

9 And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.

10 Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is

---

the fact is to be understood in the strict sense, of eating nothing. From St. Mark i. 13 we may infer that these forty days were regarded as a portion of the temptation, at least as a preliminary to the final assaults.

3. *If thou be the Son of God.*] As He had shortly before been proclaimed to be by the voice from heaven. The words of the tempter are not intended to express a doubt, but as an inducement to our Lord to exercise His divine power to relieve His hunger.

4. *Man shall not live by bread alone, &c.*] From Deut. viii. 3. Cited according to the LXX (*word* is not expressed in the Hebrew). The meaning of our Lord's reply will be best seen by referring to the context of the citation. The Israelites were fed with manna, which was previously unknown, that they might know that man doth not live by bread alone, but by all that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord, *i.e.* by anything which it has pleased God to create and appoint for that purpose. So our Lord in effect replies, "My duty is not to provide food for myself, but to trust in God's power to sustain me, His Son, in this wilderness, as He sustained Israel His Son of old, by such means as He may please to appoint."

5. *taketh him up into the holy city, &c.*] There is nothing in the narrative to imply that this took place in the spirit, or in a vision, or was anything else than what the words naturally suggest, an actual bodily presence on the pinnacle. Indeed this seems essential to the reality of the temptation. At the same time, nothing is said of the manner in which our Lord was conveyed from the wilderness to the Temple, whether by natural or supernatural means, nor of the time occupied in the transit. The language of St. Luke, "he brought (led) him to Jerusalem," seems rather to describe a natural journey.

*a pinnacle.*] In the original *the pinnacle*, indicating a single part of the building, perhaps the apex of the roof, or, as some interpret, the battlement. (It is clear from Euseb. 'H. E.' ii. 23, that 'the pinnacle' was the well-known name of the projecting end of the roof, which was surrounded by a battlement. Cf. Weiss, p. 117. F. C. C.)

6. *for it is written, &c.*] These words as they stand in the 91st Psalm do not appear to be a direct prophecy of the Messiah, but a general description of the protection afforded by God to His servants. In this sense it is indeed eminently applicable to our Lord, but not in the sense to which the tempter perverts it as an inducement to tempt God, seeking danger, in order to put His promise to the proof.

7. *Thou shalt not tempt, &c.*] To *tempt* God is to put Him to the proof—to demand evidence of His power or will to fulfil His promises, instead of waiting patiently and trusting in Him. In this sense the Israelites at Massah tempted God by demanding water. In the same sense Ahaz pretends that he will not tempt the Lord by asking a sign, though expressly commanded to do so (Isai. vii. 12). Our Lord, by citing the words of Moses (Deut. vi. 16), implies that such a trial of God's word, by casting Himself down, would be an act like that of the Israelites at Massah, not of trust, but of distrust in God.

8. *all the kingdoms of the world, &c.*] It is not necessary to inquire whether this expression is to be understood as literal or as hyperbolical. In either case the vision must be regarded as supernatural, and as embracing far more than the ordinary prospect of a wide landscape from a high mountain. The supernatural character is still more clearly marked by the language of St. Luke, "in a moment of time."

[a] Deut. 6. 13. & 10. 20.

written, [a] Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

11 Then the devil leaveth him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.

[b] Mark 1. 14. Luke 4. 14. John 4. 43.

12 ¶ [b] Now when Jesus had heard that John was [1] cast into prison, he departed into Galilee;

[1] Or, delivered up.

13 And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim:

14 That it might be fulfilled which

---

**10.** *Thou shalt worship, &c.*] Cited according to the LXX of Deut. vi. 16, except that "worship" is substituted for "fear." The fear of the Lord obviously implies a prohibition of false worship; and the language is adapted to that of the Temptation.

The order of the second and third temptations is inverted in the narrative as given by St. Luke; but the latter does not, like St. Matthew, use words implying chronological sequence. St. Matthew's appears to be true chronological order: (1) from the use of the word *then* in verses 5, 11; (2) from the nature of the temptations rising in degree to the last. In the first and second Satan works with subtlety suggesting acts: the first an apparently innocent gratification of a natural want, the second having even the appearance of a laudable confidence in God; in the third, he throws off disguise, and appears boldly in his true character. It is possible that St. Luke may have followed a local arrangement describing the two temptations in the wilderness before the intermediate one which took place in Jerusalem.

"Matthæus eo temporis ordine describit assultus, quo facti sunt. Lucas gradationem observat in locis, et describit desertum, montem, templum." (Bengel.)

The events recorded by St. John i. 19–iv. 2, must be placed immediately after the Temptation, and those chapters would therefore, in a continuous narrative of our Lord's life, be inserted between verses 11 and 12 of the present chapter. See above on verse 1.

### 12-17. The Beginning of our Lord's Ministry in Galilee.

**12.** *Now when Jesus had heard, &c.*] The true reason why Jesus departed into Galilee, which was under Herod's jurisdiction, is supplied by St. John iv. 1: "The Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John." The word rendered *departed* implies withdrawal with comparative obscurity, not therefore from the retirement in the wilderness, the last place mentioned by St. Matthew, but from some more public residence omitted by the Evangelist. The omission is supplied by St. John's account of our Lord's ministry in Judea. St. Mark (i. 14) agrees with St. Matthew in fixing this point as the date of John's imprisonment, and St. John (iii. 24) indirectly coincides with them by intimating that this event was near at hand when our Lord was in Judea, just before his departure into Galilee. St. Luke (iii. 19, 20) mentions it earlier, obviously not in its chronological place, but with a view to giving the entire account of the Baptist in one narrative.

*he departed into Galilee.*] This is our Lord's second visit to Galilee after the commencement of His ministry, the same as that recorded by St. John, iv. 3. If this departure is to be regarded as a retirement, it may explain the difficulty in John iv. 44, where He is said to have gone into Galilee, because a prophet has no honour in his own country. The intermediate events, omitted by St. Matthew, are the testimony of John the Baptist (John i. 19-34); the first call of five of the Apostles (John i. 35-51); the first journey to Galilee, probably with these five disciples; the miracle at Cana and visit to Capernaum (John ii. 1-12); the return to Jerusalem for the first Passover, and the purification of the temple (John ii. 13-25); the interview with Nicodemus (John iii. 1-21); and the baptism of disciples in Judea (John iii. 22-36). The conversation with the woman of Samaria took place during this second journey.

**13.** *And leaving Nazareth, &c.*] This verse is probably not to be taken in immediate conjunction with the last. The circumstances under which our Lord left Nazareth for Capernaum are given in detail by St. Luke (iv. 16-31), who also informs us of a previous time in which He taught in the synagogues of Galilee, being glorified of all (verse 15). On the whole, it seems most probable that the brief notice of St. Luke in this verse contains the only record in the synoptical Gospels of the events of this second visit to Galilee, which is described more in detail by St. John (iv. 43-54). This was followed by a visit to Jerusalem, narrated in the fifth chapter of St. John, after which our Lord returned a third time to Galilee (John vi. 2). It was probably during this third visit that the events took place in the synagogue at Nazareth, in consequence of which our Lord left that place and went to Capernaum. According to this view, a portion of St. John's Gospel, from iv. 45 to v. 47, should be inserted in a continuous

was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying,

[q Isai. 9. 1.] 15 [q] The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, *by* the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles;

16 The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up.

17 ¶ [r] From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. [r Mark 1. 14.]

18 ¶ [s] And Jesus, walking by the [s Mark 1. 16.]

---

narrative between the 12th and 13th verses of the present chapter. The teaching in the synagogue of "his own country" (Nazareth) subsequently recorded (Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 1), appears to have been on a later occasion, distinct from that of Luke iv. 16.

*Capernaum.*] Or rather Capharnaum, *the village of Nahum*, possibly so called from the prophet Nahum, and an indication of his residence in Galilee (Pusey, 'Minor Prophets,' p. 357). The village, however, has been by some supposed to be of later origin, as it is nowhere mentioned in the Old Testament or the Apocrypha. Its exact situation has been matter of much dispute; but the arguments of Ritter ('Geogr. of Palestine,' ii. 272-278, Eng. Tr.), and more recently the researches of Captain Wilson in connection with the Palestine Exploration Fund, seem to have identified it with Tel Hum at the north-western end of the Lake of Gennesaret. An interesting account of the excavations in the village and synagogue of Tel Hum will be found in the paper published by the Fund. Origen (on Matt. xvii. 24) and Jerome ('De Nom. Hebr.') interpret the name Capernaum as meaning a *village* or *field of consolation*, the proper name Nahum meaning *consolation;* but it is more probable that the village was named from an individual. On account of our Lord's residence at Capernaum, it is called His own city, ch. ix. 1.

15. *The land of Zabulon, &c.*] This prediction is cited in a form which differs considerably from the LXX, and which must probably be regarded as a free translation, or rather paraphrase, of the Hebrew, combining interpretation with citation. The previous affliction mentioned by Isaiah is omitted, in consequence of which the grammatical structure is changed, and the words "the land of Zabulon," &c., are put in apposition with "the people which sat in darkness." But the substance of the prophecy remains as in the original. The land of Naphtali and the country beyond Jordan are both expressly mentioned as suffering especially from the invasion of Tiglath-pileser (2 Kings xv. 29; 1 Chr. v. 26), and these countries, it is foretold, shall be made glorious by the presence of the Messiah. In illustration of this prophecy, the Evangelist from this time forth narrates in detail the events of our Lord's ministry in Galilee.

*beyond Jordan.*] If these words are to be taken in their usual sense, as denoting the country east of the Jordan, we must understand them, not as describing the position of Galilee, but as adding to it the adjacent country of Peræa, as sharing with it in our Lord's presence. The difficulty of construction partly arises from the abbreviated form in which the prophecy is cited. Perhaps the most natural interpretation of the fuller words of the original is to understand the prophet as dividing the seaward region into two parts, that beyond the Jordan and Galilee. We can hardly render, with some commentators, *near Jordan.* But perhaps the difficulty would disappear if we had more exact knowledge of the place where Isaiah's prophecy was written. (See Dr. Kay's note *in loc.* F. C. C.)

*Galilee of the Gentiles.*] This name, properly signifying *the circuit or district of the Gentiles*, seems to have been originally given on account of the heathen nations who remained in it after its occupation by the Israelites (Judges i. 33). *Galilee*, however, came early into use as a proper name (Josh. xx. 7), and seems originally to have denoted a district of the tribe of Naphtali (Josh. xxi. 32; 2 Kings xv. 29). This is the district to which the prophecy of Isaiah especially refers. At a later period, perhaps owing to the spread of the Gentile population after the captivity, the name was used in a wider extent to denote the whole northern part of Palestine, formerly occupied by the tribes of Issachar, Zabulon, Ashur, and Naphtali.

18-22. THE CALL OF FOUR DISCIPLES.

18. *And Jesus, &c.*] This call seems to be the same as that narrated with more detail by St. Luke v. 1-11. Even if we adopt St. Matthew's arrangement, and place this event before the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, yet St. Luke's narrative seems to imply that our Lord was previously known to St. Peter. It thus suggests a natural mode of reconciling the apparent discrepancy between the present passage and John i. 41. It is natural to conclude that after the events narrated by St. John (which, except in the case of Philip, do not imply any positive call)

sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers.

19 And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.

20 And they straightway left *their* nets, and followed him.

21 And going on from thence, he saw other two brethren, James *the son* of Zebedee, and John his brother, in a ship with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them.

22 And they immediately left the ship and their father, and followed him.

23 ¶ And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people.

24 And his fame went throughout all Syria: and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatick, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them.

---

the two brothers had returned for a time to their occupation as fishers, till they were called expressly to become fishers of men.

*Simon called Peter, &c.*] The name Simon is the Hebrew Simeon contracted, or perhaps slightly changed to correspond to a common Greek name, Σίμων. Hence St. Peter is sometimes called Simeon (or rather Symeon, according to the spelling of the LXX), Acts xv. 14; 2 Pet. i. 1. *Andrew* (Andreas) is of pure Greek origin. On the other hand *James* (Jacob) and *John* (Johanan) are genuine Hebrew names, as is also *Zebedee* = Zabdi (Josh. vii. 1; 1 Chron. viii. 19).

**23.** *synagogues.*] The origin of the synagogues as places of religious worship and instruction may be probably traced to the time of the Babylonian exile, though a much earlier date has been sometimes claimed for them. There is, however, no trustworthy evidence of their existence before the captivity, and the probability is that they were instituted during the seventy years of exile, as a means of observing, so far as was possible, the worship of the God of Israel in a foreign land. After the return from the captivity they seem to have been continued and increased in number, though from the silence of the Books of the Maccabees concerning them, it is probable that their principal increase belongs to a later period. In the New Testament times they had been multiplied to such an extent that nearly every town and village seems to have had one or more synagogues.

*preaching the gospel of the kingdom.*] *I. e.* proclaiming the tidings of the Messiah's kingdom, the Christian Church (see above v. 17, and on ch. iii. 2). The discourse of our Lord in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv. 16–27) may be referred to as showing in what manner our Lord "preached the gospel of the kingdom" in the synagogues.

**24.** *possessed with devils .... lunatick.*] It appears from these words that a distinction existed at this time between demoniacs and lunatics; and we may perhaps fairly infer that the symptoms of lunacy corresponding to epilepsy were at least not in all cases ascribed to demoniacal possession; though the two are coupled together in ch. xvii. 15. A comparison of the various cases in which possession is mentioned in the New Testament leads to the conclusion that the term was not applied to any one class of diseases exclusively, but that various symptoms, in some cases due to natural causes, are in other cases ascribed to demoniacal agency. Thus we find violent madness (Mark v. 4; Luke viii. 29), epilepsy (Mark ix. 18; Luke ix. 39), dumbness (Matt. ix. 32; Luke xi. 14), blindness (Matt. xii. 22), ascribed in different persons to this cause. This variety of phenomena is entirely opposed to the view of those critics who maintain that the belief in demoniacal possession was merely a vulgar error concerning a particular class of diseases. In the Scriptural account these visitations are distinguished from other diseases, not by their symptoms, but by their cause. They are represented as a power exercised by the evil spirit on the lower vital functions, the nerves and bodily organs (not necessarily on the soul or personality), producing results varying in different cases, sometimes peculiar, sometimes similar to those arising from natural causes. The absence of all mention of demoniacs in the Old Testament strengthens the supposition, in itself the most probable, that their affliction was a special manifestation of the powers of darkness, forming part of the great conflict between the kingdom of God and that of Satan, which was waged during

25 And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and *from* Decapolis, and *from* Jerusalem, and *from* Judæa, and *from* beyond Jordan.

## CHAPTER V.

1 *Christ beginneth his sermon in the mount:* 3 *declaring who are blessed,* 13 *who are the salt of the earth,* 14 *the light of the world, the city on an hill,* 15 *the candle:* 17 *that he came to fulfil the law.* 21 *What it is to kill,* 27 *to commit adultery,* 33 *to swear:* 38 *exhorteth to suffer wrong,* 44 *to love even our enemies,* 48 *and to labour after perfectness.*

AND seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his disciples came unto him:

---

our Lord's life on the earth, and the period immediately following. The details with which some of these possessions are narrated (see especially Matt. viii. 28-34; Mark v. 1-17; Luke viii. 26-36), utterly preclude the supposition that the narrators themselves regarded them as natural diseases. To adopt this supposition therefore necessarily involves one or the other of two equally inadmissible alternatives: either our Lord Himself countenanced and encouraged the vulgar error, knowing it to be an error, or He shared in the error of the age, and, while He had power to heal the disease by a word, had not knowledge to understand its nature.

25. *And there followed, &c.*] The following chapter should have begun with this verse, which is not connected in matter with the preceding verses, but with the Sermon on the Mount. Verses 23, 24, are a brief summary of events narrated more fully by St. Mark and St. Luke, and partly detailed out of chronological order by St. Matthew himself. These comprise: (1) the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mark i. 23; Luke iv. 33); (2) the healing of Peter's wife's mother (Mark i. 29; Luke iv. 38); (3) various miracles of healing on the evening of the same day (Mark i. 32; Luke iv. 40); [(2) and (3) are narrated out of the chronological order, Matt. viii. 14-16]; (4) the retirement to a desert place and subsequent preaching in the synagogues of Galilee (Mark i. 35; Luke iv. 42); (5) the healing of the leper (Mark i. 40; Luke v. 12, narrated out of order, Matt. viii. 2); (6) the healing of the paralytic (Mark ii. 1; Luke v. 18); (7) the call of Levi or Matthew (Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27); (8) the discourse on fasting (Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33) [(6) (7) and (8) are narrated out of order, Matt. ix. 2-17]; (9) the passing through the cornfields (Mark ii. 23; Luke vi. 1); (10) the healing of the withered hand (Mark iii. 1; Luke vi. 6) [(9) and (10) are narrated out of order, Matt. xii. 1-14]; (11) the ordaining of the twelve (Mark iii. 13; Luke vi. 12); (12) the healing of many among the crowd (Mark iii. 7; Luke vi. 17). After these events follows the Sermon on the Mount, the place of which is indicated in Mark iii. 13, corresponding to Luke vi. 12. An inspection of the references will show how closely St. Mark and St. Luke agree with each other in the order of this portion of the narrative.

*Decapolis.*] The region of the ten cities, a district beyond the Jordan to the E. and to the N.E. of Palestine. The names of the ten cities belonging to this region are variously given, and the nature of the connection existing between them is by no means clear. The cities usually named are not geographically contiguous, and it is probable that the union was rather based on community of privileges than on locality. Most authorities reckoned as the ten cities, Damascus, Philadelphia, Raphana, Scythopolis, Gadara, Hippos, Dios, Pella, Gerasa, Canatha (Pliny 'N. H.' v. 18). Of these, Gadara and Hippos are expressly called by Josephus Greek (*i.e.* heathen) cities ('Antiq.' xvii. 11, § 4), and probably the greater part of the population of this region was heathen.

### CHAP. V. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

Before proceeding to the contents of this sermon in detail, it is necessary to say a few words on the general question, whether it is to be regarded as a different discourse from that recorded by St. Luke vi. 17-49, or not. The former view is ably advocated by Greswell, 'Dissertations,' ii. 42; Krafft, 'Chronol. u. Harm.' p. 82. The latter is supported among others by Bishop Wordsworth on Luke vi. 17, and by Bishop Ellicott, 'Lectures,' p. 179. Dean Alford on this passage gives a summary of various hypotheses, without positively deciding in favour of any. In support of the former view it has been argued (apart from special differences in the contents of the two discourses): (1) That the place is different, being here on a mountain, in St. Luke in "the plain," or rather in "a level place." (2) That the time is different, being here fixed to a period before the calling of the Apostles, while St. Luke places it after that event. Against these two arguments it may be urged: (1) That the scene of the discourse is not placed by St. Matthew on "*a* mountain" as in our version, but in "*the* mountain," *i. e.*

2 And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying,

3 [a] Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for their's is the kingdom of heaven.

[a] Luke 6. 20.

---

the mountainous country, which is quite compatible with the supposition that our Lord may have descended from one of the higher points, whither He had ascended to pray, to a plain in the mountainous region as more suitable for addressing a multitude. (2) That St. Matthew's arrangement is not generally chronological; that the brief notices in ch. iv. 23-25 seem intended rather as a summary than as a chronological narrative; and that the mention by both Evangelists of the healing of the centurion's servant immediately after the delivery of the sermon (Matt. viii. 5; Luke vii. 1) seems to point to an identity of time, and therefore of the two discourses; that there is nothing in his language to forbid the supposition that some of the events subsequently narrated by him, including his own call to the apostleship, took place before the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount. The order of these events will be noticed as they occur in the narrative. On the whole, though there are undoubtedly difficulties on both sides of the question, the balance of probability seems in favour of the supposition that the sermon recorded by St. Matthew is identical with that given in a shorter form by St. Luke, and that the time of its delivery is more exactly given by the latter Evangelist. St. Luke's arrangement is confirmed by St. Mark, who, at ch. iii. 13, clearly indicates the place of the sermon, though he does not record its delivery. Its position in St. Matthew may perhaps be explained by the writer's desire to exhibit at the very commencement of our Lord's ministry that relation between His teaching and the Jewish law and traditions, which this sermon distinctly declares, and which this Evangelist, writing for Jews, seems principally to have intended to portray. If this be admitted, the identity of beginning and end in both Evangelists, as well as the whole form of the discourse itself, will warrant us in concluding according to the general belief of the Church, and notwithstanding some important exceptions, with the preponderating voice even of recent criticism, that this discourse was, as it professes to be, actually delivered as a whole, and not compiled by the Evangelist from detached sayings of our Lord. For a discussion of this question, see Tholuck, Introduction, § 4, who decides that the discourse is in the main given as actually delivered, though he admits some exceptions, which will be noticed in their places. See also Bp. Ellicott, 'Hist. Lect.' p. 179. (Achelis, 'Die Bergpredigt,' 1875, and Weiss, 'Das Matthæusevangelium,' 1876, may be added. F. C. C.)

1. *Into a mountain.*] In the original, "into the mountain," *i.e.* into the mountainous country—the high table land above the Lake of Gennesaret. The "plain" (or rather, "a level place") in which, according to St. Luke, the sermon was delivered, would naturally be found in this high table land, not in the valleys intersecting it. (See note on Mark iii. 13. F. C. C.)

*when he was set.*] *I.e.* when he had sat down. There is no discrepancy between this expression and that of St. Luke "*he stood* in the plain." The latter Evangelist is speaking of the position of our Lord while healing the people, *before* the delivery of the sermon. (Tholuck.)

*his disciples.*] Not merely the twelve, who, according to St. Mark and St. Luke, had just been selected, but the whole "company of his disciples" (literally "crowd," Luke vi. 17), out of whom they were selected, to whom must also be added (from Luke vi. 17) a great company of people. (Cf. Matt. vii. 28; Luke vii. 1.) A portion of the discourse, especially from verses 11-16 of the present chapter, seems especially addressed to disciples, the remainder to the people in general.

3. *Blessed are the poor in spirit.*] In this and in the fourth beatitude there appears at first sight to be a real difference between St. Matthew and St. Luke, beyond what can be explained by mere verbal variety with substantial agreement. By omitting the words *in spirit*, *after righteousness*, St. Luke appears to give a different meaning to our Lord's words which it is difficult to explain consistently with the fidelity of both reports. To suppose, as some recent commentators have done, that our Lord's words have been mutilated in St. Luke's account to suit a prevailing notion, is to deprive this gospel of all value as an authentic record, and is, as Dean Alford has observed, at variance with other passages in the same Evangelist, such as ch. xvi. 11 and xii. 21. The true explanation we believe to be that St. Luke records these beatitudes as they were actually spoken by our Lord, while St. Matthew (one of the twelve to whom it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven) reports them in such a manner as to give their ful meaning rather than their figurative expression. The one gives the words, the other the mind of Christ. Thus in the present passage a blessing is pronounced, nominally on poverty, really on the spiritual effects of poverty (just as in Matt. x. 23, 24 "they that have riches" is explained

4 Blessed *are* they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

5 [b] Blessed *are* the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

[b] Ps. 37. 11.

by, "they that trust in riches"). Poverty of possessions is not blessed, except as leading to poverty in spirit, not merely "humility," still less, as has even been suggested, "poverty in intellectual endowments," but the general disposition of trust and dependence upon God which the want of earthly means tends to produce. (Weiss, p. 132, explains it "poor in spiritual gifts and powers," and, as indicated in the following clause, "conscious of their wants." F. C. C.)

*for their's is the kingdom of heaven.*] Our Lord in the synagogue at Nazareth announces himself, in the words of Isaiah, as anointed "to preach the Gospel to the poor," and such will be the primary meaning of this beatitude, those who are poor indeed in spirit as well as in circumstances being those most ready to receive the Gospel and of whom the Church of Christ was in fact chiefly composed. The promise however must be understood both of the present and of the future life; of participation in the Church militant and in the Church triumphant. (Compare Isai. lvii. 15.)

**4.** *Blessed are they that mourn, &c.*] Here again we have an application of the words of Isaiah lxi. 2, in which Christ is announced as sent "to comfort all that mourn." And in reference to this and other similar prophecies, the Messiah is called "the consolation of Israel" (Luke ii. 25). We may thus understand these words in the first instance of those true mourners in Israel who, like Simeon, waited for the consolation of Christ's coming; and, secondly, of all those followers of Christ whose "sorrow shall be turned into joy" here and more fully hereafter. (Cf. John xvi. 20; Romans viii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 17, and especially the promise of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter whom Christ sends, John xvi. 7.) The fact that the mourners are here mentioned without any explanatory addition, perhaps confirms the conjecture that in St. Luke's version of the former beatitude we have the more exact report of our Lord's actual words.

**5.** *Blessed are the meek, &c.*] These words in the original are a literal citation from the LXX version of Psalm xxxvii. 11, "the meek shall inherit the earth." The original meaning of this passage (perhaps suggested to David by his own experience in the matter of Nabal) refers probably to the temporal blessings promised by God to His servants under the old dispensation, especially to Canaan as the promised land, under the condition however of trusting in God and waiting patiently instead of attempting to obtain possession by human power and violence. (See especially verses 3, 7, 34, of this Psalm, and compare Numbers xiv. 40-45.) Here again our Lord gives a fuller and more spiritual meaning to the temporal promises of the older covenant. In the kingdom of Christ on earth, as in the Jewish theocracy, the meek shall still inherit the earth. The Christian faith, the representative of this virtue especially, has brought, and will continue to bring, the kingdoms of the earth under its influence: the Church, both collectively and in its individual members, has gained by this, more than by any other quality, its spiritual dominion over the souls of men. But the complete fulfilment of the promise is doubtless to be looked for in the new earth hereafter, when they who have suffered with Christ shall also reign with Him. (Cf. Dan. vii. 27; Rev. iii. 21, v. 10.)

**6.** *Blessed are they which do hunger, &c.*] In St. Luke this beatitude is given simply as, "Blessed are ye that hunger now." If we suppose this to be the form in which the words were actually spoken, there is an obvious parallel to the prediction of Isaiah lv. 1, lxv. 13, where it is prophesied that thirst and hunger shall be satisfied in the Messiah's kingdom. But even as thus expressed it is obvious that the words, both in the Prophet and in the Evangelist, must be understood in a spiritual, not in a physical sense; and St. Matthew, by adding the words, "after righteousness," does but give the meaning which is implied even without the addition. (Compare John iv. 10-14.) Righteousness, indeed, is one of the chief promised blessings of the Messiah's reign (Isai. xi. 4, 5; xxxii. 1; lx. 21); and one of the names under which Christ is predicted is "the Lord our righteousness" (Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16). So here in verses 10, 11, "for righteousness' sake," and "for my sake," are used as parallel expressions. To hunger and thirst after righteousness may therefore be understood as meaning to desire the perfect righteousness of Christ's kingdom (cf. Luke i. 75). They who long for this shall be filled with righteousness, not their own, but Christ's, through whose obedience "the many shall be made righteous" (Rom. v. 19. Cf. Gal. v. 5). Of this promise, too, the complete fulfilment is to be looked for in those "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. iii. 13).

**7.** *Blessed are the merciful, &c.*] This beatitude is partially foreshadowed in the temporal promises of Psalm xli. 1-3. Its full significance in relation to Christ's kingdom may be seen from Matt. xxv. 34-40.

6 Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: [c] for they shall be filled.

[c] Isai. 65. 13.

7 Blessed *are* the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

8 [d] Blessed *are* the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

[d] Ps. 24. 4.

9 Blessed *are* the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

10 [e] Blessed *are* they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for their's is the kingdom of heaven.

[e] 1 Pet. 3. 14.

11 Blessed are ye, when *men* shall revile you, and persecute *you*, and shall say all manner of [f] evil against you [1] falsely, for my sake.

[f] 1 Pet. 4. 14.
[1] Gr. *lying*.

12 Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great *is* your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

---

**8.** *Blessed are the pure in heart, &c.*] The best comment on this beatitude is to be found in the words of St. John (1st Epistle, iii. 2, 3), "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear [perhaps rather, "when it shall have been manifested"], we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is; and every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." The sight of (as distinguished from the faith in) Him whom no man hath seen at any time, will be granted in that beatific vision, when those who now see through a glass darkly, shall see face to face. "Eo autem modo," says St. Augustine, "quo videtur sicuti est, nunc fortasse videtur a quibusdam Angelis: a nobis autem tunc ita videbitur, cum eis facti fuerimus æquales" (Epist. cxlvii. c. 9). Thus the full significance of this beatitude, as of the preceding one, relates to the consummation of Christ's kingdom hereafter. (Cf. Rev. xxii. 4.)

**9.** *Blessed are the peacemakers, &c.*] One of the titles of the Messiah is the Prince of Peace (Isai. ix. 6); the birth of Christ is announced by the heavenly host with the words "on earth peace (Luke ii. 14). A frequent title of God in the New Testament is "the God of Peace" (Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 23; Hebr. xiii. 20). Thus the peacemakers are the children of God, *i.e.* are like God. (Cf. verse 45.)

**10.** *Blessed are they which are persecuted, &c.*] The promise attached to this beatitude is the same as that of the first, and there is no reason for understanding it in a different sense. But while the first beatitude more especially relates to the temper and character which fit men to become followers of Christ, this last, as is shown by its personal application in the two following verses, more especially relates to those who are already His followers, and who suffer persecution in consequence of being so. These are already members of the kingdom of heaven—of Christ's Church militant—here on earth, and to them is assured the promise of membership in the Church triumphant hereafter. They suffer with Christ and for Christ's sake. With him, and for His sake, they shall also reign in glory.

The two following verses may be regarded as containing an explanation and an application of this the eighth and last beatitude. If, as we have previously done in verse 6, we interpret "righteousness" as especially denoting the righteousness of the Messiah's kingdom, the words "for righteousness' sake" will be properly explained by those which follow, "for my sake." It is the desire of that perfect righteousness which is in Christ, the humble endeavour to follow after that righteousness, which exposes His followers to persecution in the world; it is the attainment of that righteousness which constitutes their reward in heaven.

St. Luke, it will be remembered, enumerates only four of the beatitudes, the first, second, fourth, and eighth; and contrasts them with as many woes. This is not a sufficient reason for supposing either that St. Matthew interpolated the additional beatitudes, or St. Luke the woes. The four blessings with which woes are contrasted, are precisely those states of external privation or suffering which seem to the world to be evils; while the contrasted woes relate to the very states of enjoyment and prosperity which the world regards as blessings. No such contrast is needed in the case of the other beatitudes, for even worldly men do not go so far as to suppose that meekness, mercifulness, purity, peacefulness, are in themselves evil. We may reasonably suppose, therefore, that St. Matthew, who wrote especially for Jews, whose especial purpose it was to point out how the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom foretold by the prophets are fulfilled, and more than fulfilled in Christ, should give a fuller report of that portion of the discourse in which this is especially shown, while St. Luke, writing more for Gentiles, would select especially those portions in which the Christian estimate of blessedness and its reverse is contrasted with that of the world at large.

g Mark 9. 50. Luke 14. 34. h Mark 4. 21. Luke 8. 16. & 11. 33. 1 The word in the original signifieth *a measure containing about a pint less than a peck.*

13 ¶ Ye are the salt of the earth: g but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.

14 Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid.

15 Neither do men h light a candle, and put it under a 1 bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.

16 Let your light so shine before men, i that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

i 1 Pet. 2. 12.

17 ¶ Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.

18 For verily I say unto you, k Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one

k Luke 16. 17.

---

**13.** *Ye are the salt of the earth.*] The special use of salt being to preserve from corruption. Addressed primarily to the Apostles as teachers of the earth, it applies also to Christians in general, as living in a corrupt world, and having it as an especial duty to oppose and check the progress of corruption. The same may be said of the following expression, "the light of the world," applied to Christians in general by St. Paul (Phil. ii. 15).

*if the salt have lost his savour.*] "It is a well-known fact that the salt of this country (gathered from the marshes in dry weather), when in contact with the ground or exposed to air and sun, does become insipid and useless. . . ." (Thomson, 'The Land and the Book,' p. 382.)

This figure of the salt is given in a different connection (Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34). There is nothing in a proverbial saying of this kind to make it improbable that it may have been repeated on various occasions, and we may regard both these as most likely distinct repetitions of similar language. The same may be said of verse 15, the substance of which is repeated in Mark iv. 21; Luke viii. 16, xi. 33; the two former, however, of these being manifestly different accounts of the same discourse.

**15.** *bushel.* See note on Mark iv. 7.

**17.** *to fulfil.*] Perhaps, rather, *to make perfect, to complete*, a sense in which the same word is used, ch. xxiii. 32. The original word is frequently used by St. Matthew in the sense of fulfilling a prophecy, but this is not the sense which best suits the present context, in which it is opposed to *destroying*. By *the Law* and *the Prophets*, is here meant the Old Testament in general (as in chap. vii. 12, xi. 13, xxii. 40; Luke xvi. 16); and our Lord's words are intended to point out His relation, not to the Messianic predictions alone, but to the whole of the earlier revelation. Christ makes perfect the law and the prophets, not only by accomplishing in His own person (and here in a deeper and more spiritual sense than is implied in the literal interpretation) the types and prophecies relating to the Messiah, but also by establishing in His Church that "Kingdom of Heaven" for which the elder covenant was a preparation, and giving to the moral commands of the law a fuller significance as precepts to be observed for ever in the Church. Hence this text has a reference, both to what precedes and to what follows it, to the filling up, which we have seen in the beatitudes of the Old Testament outlines of the Messiah's kingdom, and to the comment, which follows, on the spirit as distinguished from the letter of the commandments.

**18.** *verily.*] In the original, *Amen*. This word, used as a substantive means *truth;* as in Isai. lxv. 16, "the God of truth." In its more frequent use as an adverb, it means *truly*, but is most frequently used in the Old Testament in the sense of *so be it* (γένοιτο LXX), as in Numb. v. 22; Deut. xxvii. 15, *seq.*; Jer. xi. 5. In the Old Testament its most frequent use is at the end of a prayer to confirm what is said by others, as in the above passages, or by oneself, as in Ps. xli. 13; lxxii. 19. In the New Testament it is more frequently used as here, in affirmation of something that is to follow. (Maldonatus.) In this latter use, "verily I say," it is never employed, except by our Lord Himself, "the Amen, the faithful, and true witness" (Rev. iii. 14).

*Till heaven and earth pass, &c.*] That the Law (the Old Testament covenant) shall last as long as the world endures, is intimated in Jeremiah xxxiii. 20, 21, and more distinctly declared in the Apocrypha and in Philo (see Baruch i. 4; Philo, 'Vit. Quæs.,' p. 256). It is probable, therefore, that our Lord's words in some way allude to the prevalent belief of His day, and are best explained by reference to it. In reference to this belief, as to the Law itself, we may naturally expect to find as in the previous parts of this discourse, an acceptance of it in a fuller and more spiritual sense than the literal interpretation would suggest. And such a sense is perhaps implied

tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

19 [l] Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

[l] Jam. 2. 10.

20 For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

21 ¶ Ye have heard that it was said [l] by them of old time, [m] Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment:

[l] Or, *to them.*
[m] Ex. 20. 13. Deut. 5. 17.

---

in the additional words, *till all be fulfilled* (more literally *till all things* shall have come to pass; the word translated *fulfilled* being not the same as in verse 17), *i.e.* till the whole purpose of the Law be accomplished, that purpose being one that shall be carried on till the end of the world. The purpose of this discourse is to represent the elder dispensation as a preparation for the kingdom of heaven. The Law is not destroyed, but perfected when it is developed into the Church of Christ with which He has promised to be present, even to the end of the world.

*one jot or one tittle.*] Jot (iota) *Yod*, the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet: *tittle*, (Heb. *keren*,) the small strokes by which similar letters are distinguished from each other. No portion of the Law passes away and is utterly destroyed: all is perfected and remains in its own manner; the typical and ceremonial portions, in their antitypes in the kingdom of Christ; the moral portions, in their own perpetual obligation.

(The rabbinical sayings which bear upon this passage are given by Lightfoot, Wetstein and Meyer. Among the most important are these; Bereshith R. x. 1: Omni rei sunt termini, cœlo et terræ sunt termini, una re excepta cui non sunt termini, et hæc est lex. Shemoth R. vi.: Nulla littera aboletur a lege in æternum. F. C. C.)

**19.** *Whosoever therefore shall break, &c.*] Rather, *shall annul* or *destroy*; it does not refer to the practical transgression of an acknowledged law, but to the teaching that certain portions of the Law are not to be acknowledged as valid. With this sense, it seems better to interpret the "kingdom of heaven" of the Christian dispensation on earth in its relation to the Law, than of the heavenly kingdom hereafter. He best fulfils his duty as a follower of Christ, who, both in his own conduct and in his teaching of others, acknowledges the divine character of the Old Testament, as the beginning of that divine and unchangeable purpose which is completed in the New. He, on the other hand, least apprehends the true character of Christianity who regards it as the destruction, not as the consummation, of the law. It is a perverse ingenuity which sees in this teaching a contradiction to that of St. Paul. The doctrine is the same as that of St. Paul. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." As regards the non-observance of the ceremonial law of Moses in its literal acceptation, it will be sufficient to observe that this is no peculiarity of the teaching of St. Paul, but the sentence of the entire council of Apostles and elders assembled at Jerusalem, interpreting the mind of their Lord by the aid of the Holy Spirit: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Our Lord's words are in no way antagonistic to the language of St. Paul, or to the practice of the whole Church from the beginning, but (to use the words of Dean Alford) they "are decisive against such persons, whether ancient or modern, as would set aside the Old Testament as without significance, or inconsistent with the New."

**20.** *For I say unto you, &c.*] This verse is closely joined to the preceding. Christians are not merely bound to acknowledge the obligation of the law, but to carry it out more fully than its professed expounders and rigid observers, the Scribes and Pharisees, *i.e.*, to obey it in the spirit, not merely in the letter, as instanced in the following verses. The mention of the Scribes and Pharisees shows that our Lord's words in the following verses are directed, not against the law as given by Moses, but against those current interpretations of it, which preserved the letter only while destroying the spirit.

**21.** *by them of old time.*] Rather, "**to them of old time.**" The contrast is primarily between the Law as given to the men of old, and the Gospel as given "to you." The same Divine Lawgiver is the author of both, giving to each as they are able to receive. Thus far the gospel is merely an expansion and amplification of the law. But there is a further contrast indicated by the expression "ye have heard," between the law as given by Moses, and the law as taught to the people by the Scribes and Pharisees, probably by

22 But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

23 Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee;

---

means of paraphrastic versions in the vulgar tongue. What was delivered to the people as the law was in fact the law accompanied by a gloss, and to this gloss the precepts of our Lord are sometimes in direct antagonism.

*Thou shalt not kill, &c.*] Here we have the sixth commandment, together with a rabbinical gloss, which latter, however, though not found *verbatim* in Scripture, may perhaps be gathered from Numb. xxxv. 30; Deut. xix. 11, 12. The commandment receives a higher spiritual force, being extended from the act to the states of mind leading to it. The gloss declaring the punishment is made the occasion of denouncing a stricter law of punishment, embracing sins of thought and word, and not merely of deed.

*the judgment.*] From Deut. xix. 12, xxi. 2, 3, it may probably be inferred that the cognizance of charges of murder rested with the elders in each city, *i.e.* with the local tribunals, the institution of which is commanded, Deut. xvi. 18. In the time of the kings the office of judge in these courts seems to have been chiefly exercised by the Levites (1 Chron. xxiii. 4, xxvi. 22; 2 Chron. xix. 8). After the captivity they were re-established, Ezra vii. 25. Josephus ('Antiq.' iv. 8, § 14) describes the original courts as composed of seven judges, with two Levites as subordinates to each, a description which may perhaps have been taken from the later constitution of his own day. In the Talmud (Sanhedrin i. 6) they are described as consisting of twenty-three members in all places where there was a population of 120, and of three members in smaller places—a statement which may perhaps be reconciled with that of Josephus, if we suppose the subordinate officers, and perhaps one or two supernumeraries, to be included. These courts in their original constitution had the power of inflicting death for murder, and for some other offences (Deut. xxi. 19-22), and this seems to have been continued at their reinstitution (Ezra vii. 26) till the power of life and death was taken away by the Romans. They had also the power of punishing minor offences with banishment, or fine, or imprisonment (Ezra vii. 26), or stripes. The scourging in the synagogues (ch. x. 17) was probably inflicted by the judgment of these courts. Religious offences, such as blasphemy, seem to have belonged to the jurisdiction of the higher tribunal, the *council* or Sanhedrim for which see on ch. ii. 4.

**22.** *without a cause.*] These words are not found in some MSS, and are perhaps an interpolation. *Raca*, probably vain, empty fellow. (Heb. ריק—the ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ of James ii. 20, where, however, it is not spoken in anger nor against an individual; others interpret it as an interjection of contempt, from a verb רקק signifying to spit out.) *Thou fool* (μωρέ) probably implying a moral reproach as in Psalm xiv. 1. Some suppose this term, as well as the preceding, to be a Hebrew word, מורה (*moreh*), *rebel*, the word which Moses was condemned for using, Numb. xx. 10, and which denotes a sin punishable with death, Deut. xxi. 18-20. With regard to the punishments denounced a question arises, whether they are to be understood literally or figuratively. There seems to be an incongruity in passing literally from the human events described by "the judgment" and "the council," to the divine sentence of the "Gehenna of fire." The most natural interpretation seems to be to suppose that three degrees of human punishment are used to denote by analogy three corresponding degrees of the divine sentence hereafter; *the judgment*, *the council*, *the Gehenna of fire* will thus figuratively represent three degrees of the divine vengeance against sin, corresponding to three degrees of temporal punishment under the Jewish law: death by the sword, inflicted by the minor courts; death by stoning, inflicted by the Sanhedrim, and finally death with the body cast into the valley of Hinnom to be burned. It is not certain that this last punishment was ever actually inflicted under the Jewish law; it may be mentioned as an extreme case beyond the legal punishments, though in one case at least, as Tholuck observes, death by fire was ordained (see Levit. xx. 14) though no place of punishment is specified (compare 1 Macc. iii. 5).

**23.** *Therefore if, &c.*] This verse is closely connected with the preceding. If thou hast offended thy brother in any of the ways above mentioned. A comparison with Mark xi. 25 shows that the words "hath ought against" apply to the sufferer, not to the doer of the wrong. Our Lord's words are therefore sup-

24 Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.

25 [a]Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.

26 Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

27 ¶ Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, [b]Thou shalt not commit adultery:

28 But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

29 [c]And if thy right eye [1]offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell.

30 And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast *it* from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell.

31 It hath been said, [d]Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:

[a] Luke 12. 58.
[b] Ex. 20. 14.
[c] ch. 18. 8. Mark 9. 47.
[1] Or, *do cause thee to offend.*
[d] Deut. 24. 1.

---

posed to be addressed to one who in anger has done a wrong to his brother.

**24.** *Leave there thy gift.*] This passage may be understood as combining two lessons: (1) the most sacred of all occupations should not be an impediment to the duty of reconciliation; (2) thy gift will not be acceptable to God while offered in enmity against thy brother. On this precept is founded the rule of the Church, requiring adversaries to be reconciled before partaking of the Holy Communion.

**25-26.** *Agree with thine adversary, &c.*] In connection with the context, these two verses seem most naturally to bear a parabolical sense; the image of an earthly judgment for debt being used to illustrate what was previously said of God's judgment against unrepented enmity. As it is wise to be reconciled with an adversary at law, before the final sentence is pronounced, so it is wise to be reconciled to the brother whom we have offended, while there is yet time, before the final judgment of God comes upon the sin. There is no need to find an exact spiritual counterpart for each of the terms denoting the temporal judgment, the *adversary*, the *judge*, the *officer*, the *prison;* the general analogy is sufficiently clear without laying stress on the special terms. Thus understood the words have a natural connection with their context; and the repetition of similar language in a different connection (Luke xii. 58) is no argument against their proper position here. They might be repeated on more than one occasion.

**27.** The seventh commandment is given without any gloss, but there is some reason to suppose that the traditional interpretation confined the sin to the act of adultery, not including the unlawful desire, and this notwithstanding the evidence of the tenth commandment to the contrary. Passages to this effect from the Rabbis, as well as from Josephus ('Antiq.' xii. 9, § 1), are cited by Tholuck. Our Lord making perfect the law, gives the full import of the commandment as condemning the beginning no less than the completion of the sin.

**29.** *offend thee.*] Rather, *cause thee to stumble*, *i.e.* be an occasion of sin. The general sense of this passage is clear, "cut away that which is most precious, if it cause thee to sin." This is forcibly expressed by the sensible images of "the right eye" and "the right hand," the former being naturally suggested by the previous mention of the look of lust.

**30.** *into hell.*] In the original, *Gehenna.* The fire of the valley of Hinnom, which in verse 22 was used to indicate by comparison the highest degree of God's future punishment of sin, is here used figuratively to express the same thing.

The substance of these two verses is repeated in ch. xviii. 8, 9, with a different context. This repetition furnishes an argument in favour of the unity of the present discourse. It shows that we have the testimony of one and the same Evangelist to the fact of our Lord repeating nearly similar words on distinct occasions, and thus furnishes a presumption that other parallels recorded by the other Evangelists may be similarly explained.

**31, 32.** These two verses again are closely

r Luke 16. 18. 1 Cor. 7. 10.

32 But I say unto you, That [r]whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

33 ¶ Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, [s]Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:

s Ex. 20. 7. Lev. 19. 12. Deut. 5. 11.

34 But I say unto you, Swear not

---

connected with the preceding; the commandment being extended to another class of actions, not recognised as adultery in the ordinary current interpretation of the law, namely nominal marriage with a divorced person. Here again our Lord's words immediately relate, not to the letter of the law, but to the ordinary interpretation of it. The words of Deut. xxiv. 1, are cited with the omission of the cause of divorce, "because he hath found some uncleanness in her." Thus cited, it expresses the commonly received teaching, that of the school of Hillel, which allowed divorce for the most trifling causes, and thus practically abolished the condition altogether. A similar interpretation "for any cause whatsoever" is given by Josephus ('Ant.' iv. 8, § 23). The school of Shammai, on the contrary, interpreted the uncleanness strictly of adultery, or at least immodest conduct. The prevalence of the former view appears in the question of the Pharisees (ch. xix. 3), where the law is interpreted as permitting divorce "for every cause." As, however, it is there said that the original permission of divorce was given on account of the "hardness of their heart," we must see that even its most strict interpretation involved some relaxation of the primitive law of marriage as instituted at the beginning. Our Lord's words are thus not only a condemnation of the gloss of the Hillelites, but also a revocation of the original permission of the law as serving a temporary purpose only. Some critics, and notably Döllinger (' First Age of the Church,' ii. 226), interpret the fornication here spoken of as meaning incontinence before marriage, such as that spoken of in Deut. xxii. 13-21. An interpretation which requires us to believe that this sin is a greater breach of the marriage bond than adultery itself, is not to be received without the most convincing evidence of its necessity; and in this case it cannot be said that such necessity exists. The word here translated *fornication* (πορνεία) though generally applied to indiscriminate profligacy is sometimes like the corresponding English word used of unchastity in general, and even with express reference to married women as in Ecclus. xxiii. 23, and 1 Cor. v. 1, where it appears from 2 Cor. vii. 12 that the husband was still alive. The fact that St. Mark (x. 10) and St. Luke (xvi. 18) omit the exception, only shows that they thought it sufficient to mention the rule which is the point of chief importance in our Lord's precept, without noticing the exception, which is sufficiently guaranteed by the testimony of St. Matthew. An able answer to Döllinger's argument will be found in a paper by the late Professor Conington in the 'Contemporary Review' for May, 1869.

32. *causeth her to commit adultery.*] In case she marry again, her first marriage being in the sight of God still binding. The husband commits the same sin if he marry another woman. (See ch. xix. 9.) Whether remarriage is also forbidden in the one case in which divorce is permitted will be best considered in connection with this latter chapter and the parallel passage, Mark x. 12; Luke xvi. 18.

33. *Again, ye have heard, &c.*] The discourse now passes to a new subject, that of oaths. The Old Testament reference seems to be partially to the Third Commandment (which, however, primarily relates to profane swearing, though perhaps also to perjury), but more directly to Levit. xix. 12. To this, however, is added a second clause, perhaps in substance taken from Deut. xxiii. 21, but which seems to have been practically employed as a gloss on the former, so as to render it of more effect. We know from ch. xxiii. 16 that the Scribes and Pharisees declared oaths to be binding or not, according to the supposed sanctity of the object sworn by; and from other evidence it appears that some at least considered both profane swearing and perjury to be excusable, provided the oath was not taken in the name of God. The words "thou shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths," seem thus to have been interpreted, so as to imply that the performance was not obligatory where the oath was neither a vow to the Lord nor made in His name. (See the Rabbinical authorities cited by Lightfoot.) Our Lord's words may therefore be interpreted with reference to this casuistry. Avoid not only perjury, but swearing at all, and make no difference between swearing by God's creatures and swearing by God Himself. The immediate import of the words is thus to teach that a false oath is always false, and a profane oath always profane, whether it be made directly in the name of God or not. The

at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne:

35 Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King.

36 Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black.

37 [i]But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

38 ¶ Ye have heard that it hath been said, [a]An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:

39 But I say unto you, [b]That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have *thy* cloke also.

41 And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

42 Give to him that asketh thee, and [c]from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

43 ¶ Ye have heard that it hath been said, [d]Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.

44 But I say unto you, [e]Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and [f]pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

45 That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

[i] Jam. 5. 12.
[a] Ex. 21. 24. Lev. 24. 20. Deut. 19. 21.
[b] Luke 6. 29. Rom. 12. 17. 1 Cor. 6. 7.
[c] Deut. 15. 8.
[d] Lev. 19. 18.
[e] Luke 6. 27.
[f] Luke 23. 34. Acts 7. 60.

---

conduct of our Lord Himself in answering the adjuration of the High Priest (ch. xxvi. 63, 64), as well as the language of St. Paul on various occasions (Rom. i. 9; 2 Cor. i. 23; Gal. i. 20; cf. Heb. vi. 16, 17), may be adduced to show that this passage is not intended to forbid an appeal to God on solemn occasions.

**37.** *cometh of evil.*] In the original *is of the evil.* It seems most natural to interpret these words of the *evil one.* To require more than a simple affirmation as a guarantee of truth; to make the simple word less sacred than the oath, is so far to weaken the obligation of speaking truth and to act under the instigation of the father of lies. (Weiss defends the other interpretation, Matt. E. p. 167. F. C. C.)

**38.** *An eye for an eye, &c.*] The retaliation enacted by the law was to be administered by a court of justice; and therefore did not imply any spirit of revenge or private animosity in the judge inflicting it. But without denying the justice of the law, the question may still be raised how far the person injured is bound to seek for justice. It may be a man's duty personally to forgive an injury, though it is the duty of the judge if the case comes before him to inflict the penalty. This is indeed recognised in the Old Testament (see Levit. xix. 18; Prov. xxiv. 29). Our Lord's words are directed, not against the law in itself, but against the perversion of the law by allowing its enactment to foster a spirit of personal revenge. He warns His disciples against an eagerness to avail themselves of the law, by way of revenge against a personal insult or even for the defence of property; they are rather to submit to wrong.

**40.** *thy cloke.*] This is the upper garment which served as a covering by night, and which it was forbidden to retain in pledge (see Exod. xxii. 26). The precept therefore may be understood as meaning, "Be ready to give up even that which by law cannot be taken."

**41.** *compel thee.*] The word in the original properly implies a legal requisition, being taken from the compulsory service employed in Persia for carrying royal dispatches. In a secondary sense, however, it is used for any forced service, as that of Simeon the Cyrenian who was compelled to bear our Lord's cross. Perhaps, however, the word may be here taken literally; as this compulsory service to foreign governments was particularly distasteful to the Jews. (See Josephus, 'Ant.' xiii. 2, § 3, cited by Alford on this place.)

**43.** *Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.*] Only the first part of this precept is found in the Law; the second part seems to have been a Rabbinical gloss, and is therefore condemned as perverting the Law. How contrary this gloss is to the spirit of the Law itself may be seen from Exod. xxiii. 4, 5; cf. Job xxxi. 29; Prov. xxiv. 17; xxv. 21.

**44.** *Bless—hate you.*] The two oldest MSS omit this clause, and the words *them which despitefully use you.* So, too, late critical editions. They are found in the great majority of MSS. F. C. C.

**45.** *The children of your Father.*] *I.e.* like Him in doing good. (Cf. John viii. 39, 44.)

g Luke 6. 32.

46 g For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?

47 And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others?* do not even the publicans so?

48 Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

## CHAPTER VI.

1 *Christ continueth his sermon in the mount, speaking of alms,* 5 *prayer,* 14 *forgiving our brethren,* 16 *fasting,* 19 *where our treasure is to be laid up,* 24 *of serving God, and mammon:* 25 *exhorteth not to be careful for worldly things:* 33 *but to seek God's kingdom.*

TAKE heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward [1]of your Father which is in heaven.

2 Therefore [h]when thou doest *thine* alms, [1]do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

3 But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth:

4 That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly.

5 ¶ And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites *are:* for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men.

1 Or, *with.*

h Rom. 12. 8.

1 Or, *cause not a trumpet to be sounded.*

---

46. *the publicans.*] *I.e.* tax-gatherers. The Roman name *publicani*, which our translators have employed in this and other places, properly denoted, not the collectors, but the farmers of the customs, wealthy men of the equestrian order, who paid a rent to the state for the public revenues and collected them for their own profit. The proper name for the actual collectors was *portitores*. These latter were sometimes freedmen or slaves, sometimes natives of the province in which the tax was collected. These men as a class were generally detested both from the unpopularity of their occupation, and in many cases from their own character, especially among the Jews who hated the tribute as a mark of subjection to the Romans, and regarded the Jewish publicans themselves as polluted through the intercourse with Gentiles necessitated by their occupation. Their general ill repute is sufficiently attested by the union of their names with "harlots," "heathen," "sinners," &c.

48. *perfect.*] St. Luke (vi. 36) gives *merciful*, and it is probable that the two words have the same meaning. The language seems to relate chiefly, if not solely, to the perfection of Divine love (verse 45), enforcing the command of verse 44; and the comparison of man to God can hardly be carried back to the verses before this. The meaning therefore is, "let your love be perfect, embracing enemies as well as friends, as the love of God is manifested to the evil as well as to the good." This text was perverted by the Pelagians in support of the doctrine of man's perfectibility in this life. See Augustine, *De Peccatorum meritis et remissione* (lib. ii. c. 15).

*your Father which is in heaven.*] The best MSS and late editions have **your heavenly Father.** F. C. C.

CHAP. VI. 1. *alms.*] The marginal reading, "righteousness," is probably correct, and shews the connection between this chapter and the preceding better than the received word "alms." In ch. v. 20 the disciples are told that their *righteousness* is to exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees. This is explained at length in what follows: in the preceding chapter as regards the actions themselves; in the present as regards the motives and manner of performing them. Almsgiving, in the language of the later Rabbis, was especially called *righteousness* (see Lightfoot); but in the present passage it seems rather to mean good works in general, including *almsgiving*, *prayer*, and *fasting*.

2. *sound a trumpet.*] It is probable that this expression is to be understood figuratively, *do it not with ostentation.* There is no evidence of the literal use of a trumpet on these occasions, nor is it probable that such a practice would have prevailed in the synagogues. That synagogues proper are here intended, and not merely crowds of people as is sometimes supposed, seems to be clear. 1st. From the distinction between *the synagogues* and *the streets*, whereas mere crowds would naturally be in the streets. 2nd. From the fact that alms were actually collected in the synagogues on the Sabbath day. (See Lightfoot on this place.)

Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

6 But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.

7 But when ye pray, use not vain [a]repetitions, as the heathen *do:* for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.

8 Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.

9 After this manner therefore pray ye: [b]Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.

10 Thy kingdom come. Thy

[a] Ecclus. 7. 14.
[b] Luke 11.

---

*have their reward.*] Literally, **have in full.** They receive the reward they seek in the praise of men, as distinguished from the reward given by God.

**6.** *openly.*] This is omitted in some old MSS, ℵ B D, and ancient versions. F. C. C.

**7.** *use not vain repetitions.*] The original word literally means to *stammer;* hence, to repeat often the same word or syllable, after the manner of a stammerer. For this heathen practice of incessantly repeating the name of God or some single formula, see 1 Kings xviii. 26; Acts xix. 34. And the same is still practised by Eastern devotees. (Compare also Eccles. v. 2, vii. 14.) The precept is not directed against the frequent repetition of earnest prayer (see Luke xviii. 11), but against the superstitious repetition of a mechanical form in the hope of being better heard by God, which is the point of Elijah's taunt to the prophets of Baal (1 Kings xviii. 27). Our Lord's own example sanctions the earnest use both of long and of repeated prayers. (See Luke vi. 12; Matt. xxvi. 44.)

**9.** The Lord's Prayer is given with an entirely different context, and according to some MSS in a much shorter form, by St. Luke, xi. 1-4. The various readings of St. Luke's text do not belong to this place, unless we suppose his account to refer to the same occasion with St. Matthew, so as to require a comparison of the two texts with each other. It is more probable, however, that St. Luke gives a distinct form of the prayer, delivered on a different occasion. It is placed at a far later period of our Lord's ministry, and is uttered at the request of "one of his disciples," possibly one of the seventy mentioned in the preceding chapter who had been called subsequently to the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount. Each form, therefore, must be considered by itself.

The attempt of some critics to derive the Lord's Prayer from the Zendavesta is examined and refuted by Tholuck. The supposition that our Lord made use of existing Jewish forms of prayer, though in itself more probable, is deficient in historical proof; except as regards the first two petitions, which may possibly have been adopted from an existing prayer of the synagogue (the Kaddish), but which also may have been directly suggested by passages of the Old Testament. That our Lord should have drawn the material of this prayer from the Scriptures is quite in accordance with the previous character of the whole discourse, yet, in point of fact it is only in the opening words and in the first and second petitions that this connection can be clearly traced.

**9.** *Our Father.*] This name is given to God, in relation to the people of Israel, in Deut. xxii. 6; Isai. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8; Jer. iii. 4, 19; Mal. i. 6; and in relation to the individual in 2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 26. In the present passage it is especially appropriate in a prayer to be used by those disciples whom our Lord had just before spoken of as the "children of their Father in heaven" (ch. v. 45). In the vocative case as an address to God in prayer it does not occur in the Old Testament.

*Hallowed be thy name, &c.*] This and the following petition are found in a prayer which may possibly have been used in the synagogue at this time, "Let His great name be glorified and sanctified in the world . . . . May He cause His kingdom to have dominion in your life and in your days." The meaning of the former is that the holy God may be honoured as holy both with our lips and in our lives. (Cf. Levit. x. 3, xxii. 32; Num. xx. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 15.) The latter, as used by the Jews, was a petition for the speedy approach of the Messiah's kingdom. (See on ch. iii. 2.) In the mouth of a Christian it has a twofold application, relating, like the beatitudes (see on ch. v. 3-10), in the first instance to the spread of Christ's Church on earth, but secondly and more fully to His triumphant reign hereafter. (See Rev. xxii. 17, 20.) The one indeed is but the beginning of which the other is the completion. So they are combined in the Burial Service of the Church of England: "Beseeching thee, that it may please thee, of thy gracious good-

will be done in earth, as *it is* in heaven.

11 Give us this day our daily bread.

12 And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

13 And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

14 [l]For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you:

[l] Mark 11. 25.

15 But if ye forgive not men their

---

ness, shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom."

10. *Thy will be done, &c.*] This third petition is in fact an expansion of the second, which perhaps may account for its omission (according to what is probably the true text) in the shorter form recorded by St. Luke. The prayer, that God will hasten His kingdom, implies a prayer that man may be enabled to take part in bringing it to pass, by doing His will on earth. The final and full accomplishment of this prayer, when men shall do God's will as the angels that do his pleasure, is predicted partially in the Old Testament, and more fully in the New. (Cf. Isai. xi. 9, lx. 19-21, lxi. 11; Rev. xxi. 3, 22-27; xxii. 3.)

11. *our daily bread.*] The word *daily*, though not an exact translation, probably expresses as nearly as any single word can, the sense of the much disputed word (ἐπιούσιος), which occurs only here and in the corresponding passage of St. Luke. Of the various meanings assigned to it, the two most probable are *sufficient*, as opposed to *superfluous*, and *for the coming day*, which with the present context may be regarded as equivalent to *instant* or *immediately needed*—a limitation, however, which is suggested only by the use of the words *this day*, not by any fancied opposition between this verse and verses 31, 34. To pray that God will provide is a very different thing from being anxious to provide for ourselves. Either of the above senses is to some extent implied in our own version, *daily bread.*

(The meaning has been fully discussed by Professor Lightfoot, 'On a fresh Revision of the N. T.,' pp. 195-242, who renders it "for the coming day;" and by Dr. W. Kay, in the Journal of Philology, vol. v. pp. 48-51, who defends the meaning, "bread suited to our ordinary or immediate wants." Weiss, 'Matthæusevangelium,' p. 185, has a concise but able note, in which he maintains the same interpretation, comparing it with Prov. xxx. 8. Dr. McClellan defends the patristic explanation, "supersubstantialis," adopted by Jerome in the Vulgate: but Dean Mansel's note represents the general opinion of scholars. F. C. C.)

12. *our debts.*] *I.e.* our sins, as explained in verse 14, and expressed in Luke xi. 4. *As we forgive, i.e.* in the same manner as; expressed in St. Luke, *for we also forgive.* This prayer can be used with sincerity only by those who are conscious of a forgiving temper towards others. There is a remarkable parallel in Ecclus. xxviii. 2.

13. *lead us not into temptation.*] *I. e.* place us not in circumstances which may furnish an occasion of sin. The external circumstances in which men are placed by God's will may furnish more or less of temptation to sin; the internal assent, which yields to the temptation, is not of God. In this latter sense no man is tempted of God, but of his own lust (James i. 13, 14). In the former sense we pray that God will not place us in circumstances of especial temptation. This is perfectly compatible with the admission that such temptations, should it please God to send them as trials, may when rightly used be even an occasion of joy (James i. 2), just as it is the duty of a Christian to avoid persecution when he may lawfully do so (ch. x. 23), notwithstanding the blessing pronounced on those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake (ch. v. 10).

*from evil.*] The words may also be rendered, *from the evil one;* but the neuter is more comprehensive, and includes deliverance from the evil thoughts of a man's own heart, and from evils from without, as well as from the temptations of Satan. In this sense, they include the hope of St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 18), "The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work." Compare also John xvii. 15; 2 Thess. iii. 3.

(Weiss, *l. c.* p. 187, argues that the neuter is alone suited to the context; he takes "evil" as equivalent to sin. F. C. C.)

*For thine is the kingdom, &c.*] The Doxology is omitted by the majority of modern editors (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth), who regard it as an interpolation derived from the use of the prayer in the Liturgies of the Early Church, with an ascription of praise added. The principal argument against it rests on its absence from four of the oldest uncial (א B D Z) and five cursive MSS, from the Latin and Coptic versions, and from the citations of the Latin Fathers. On the other hand, it is found, with occasional variations, in nine uncials and at least 150 cursives, in the

trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

16 ¶ Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

17 But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face;

18 That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.

19 ¶ Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal:

20 [m] But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal:

[m] Luke 12. 33. 1 Tim. 6. 19.

21 For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

22 [n] The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.

[n] Luke 11. 34.

23 But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great *is* that darkness!

24 ¶ [o] No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

[o] Luke 16. 13.

---

Syriac, Sahidic, Ethiopic, Gothic, and Armenian versions, and is supported by preponderating evidence from the Greek Fathers. An elaborate examination of the evidence, with an able defence of the received text, will be found in the late Rev. J. Forshall's edition of the first twelve chapters of this Gospel.

**16.** *Moreover when ye fast.*] This introduces the third division of the righteousness or good works mentioned in verse 1. Fasting, like almsgiving and prayer, is to be done sincerely and without ostentation.

**19.** *Lay not up, &c.*] There is a natural transition here from the special precept to regard God and not man in the discharge of religious duties, to the general injunction to seek the treasure of God's favour, and not the riches of the earth. The same injunction is repeated in substance, Luke xii. 33, 34; but with a variation of language which, even apart from the difference of context, is sufficient to mark it as belonging to a distinct occasion. But in St. Luke, as well as in St. Matthew, the words occur in their natural connection in a continuous discourse; and thus the two discourses as wholes, notwithstanding the similarity of language in parts, are sufficiently marked out as delivered on separate occasions.

**22.** *The light of the body, &c.*] The connection of these verses with the preceding seems to be somewhat as follows. Man's affections (*the heart* of verse 21) determine his knowledge: he who has no love for heavenly things will have no knowledge of them. He whose affections are fixed on heavenly things has his whole soul enlightened; he whose affections are depraved has his understanding and his whole soul darkened also. This is expressed figuratively, under the image of the eye and the body. The *heart* in Scripture is the principle of personal life, the source from which proceed good and evil impulses and thoughts. (Cf. ch. ix. 4, xii. 34, xv. 19; Luke v. 22, xxiv. 38; Heb. iv. 12; and see Delitzsch, 'Bibl. Psych.,' p. 248, 2nd edition.) On this, therefore, the intellectual as well as the moral and religious character is ultimately dependent. This is acknowledged even by heathen moralists. (Cf. Aristotle, 'Eth. Nic.' vi. 12, τοῦτο δ' εἰ μὴ τῷ ἀγαθῷ, οὐ φαίνεται· διαστρέφει γὰρ ἡ μοχθηρία καὶ διαψεύδεσθαι ποιεῖ περὶ τὰς πρακτικὰς ἀρχάς.) There is thus an intimate connection between the present verses and the preceding, sufficient to show that they are properly placed here; though they are repeated again, also with an appropriate though different context, Luke xi. 34.

*single.*] The figurative use of the term *eye* to denote that moral and spiritual knowledge which is dependent on the state of the heart, is further shown by the expression *single* used as the opposite of *evil.* (Compare *singleness of heart*, Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22.) This expression thus serves to introduce the next precept. As the heart must be single, no man can serve two masters.

**24.** *mammon.*] Or more correctly, *Mamon*, *i.e. Riches* (Chald. and Syr.). The word is here

25 Therefore I say unto you, ᵖTake no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

ᵖ Ps. 55. 22. Luke 12. 22. 1 Pet. 5. 7.

26 Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?

27 Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?

28 And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

29 And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

30 Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O ye of little faith?

31 Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?

32 (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.

33 But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

34 Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day *is* the evil thereof.

## CHAPTER VII.

1 *Christ ending his sermon in the mount, reproveth rash judgment,* 6 *forbiddeth to cast holy things to dogs,* 7 *exhorteth to prayer,* 13 *to enter in at the strait gate,* 15 *to beware of false prophets,* 21 *not to be hearers, but doers of the word:* 24 *like houses builded on a rock,* 26 *and not on the sand.*

---

used as a personification, but there is no ground for supposing that any idol was actually worshipped under this name.

**25.** *Take no thought for.*] More exactly, *be not anxious about.* According to the usual derivation of the original word, it literally signifies to be *divided* in mind. Compare the expression in St. Luke (xii. 29), "Neither be ye of doubtful mind," or be in suspense. In this sense it is peculiarly appropriate as following the precept against attempting to serve *two* masters. Let not even the necessary things of this life so distract the mind as to turn it from the service of God; but let your labour for these things be undertaken in the trust that God will provide them. That labour is not excluded but rather implied, appears from verses 26, 28. The fowls and the lilies which labour not are contrasted with man, whom God has commanded to labour.

*Is not the life more than meat.*] Will not therefore God, who has given the greater gifts, the life and the body, also provide the lesser, food and raiment?

**27.** *stature.*] The majority of modern commentators render *age, term of life;* which perhaps is more suited to the context; but the examples quoted seem hardly sufficient to justify the metaphor of a *cubit* as a measure of time. The same word is used in the sense of *stature*, Luke xix. 3. (Weiss, who adopts the meaning, "term of life," defends "cubit" by reference to Ps. xxxix. 6. Dean Scott suggests that the application of πῆχυς, cubit, to time may be justified by the quotation from Mimnermus in Stobæus, τοῖς ἴκελοι πήχυιον ἐπὶ χρόνον ἄνθεσιν ἥβης τερπόμεθα. F. C. C.)

**30.** *the grass of the field.*] "The wild flowers which form part of the meadow-growth are counted as belonging to the grass, and are cut down with it. Cut grass, which soon withers from the heat, is still used in the East for firing." (Alford.)

**33.** *the kingdom of God, and his righteousness.*] According to the interpretation adopted in verse 1, the *kingdom of God* will naturally mean the service of Christ, and *His righteousness* those good works which Christ's servants are bound to do for His sake, and in the spirit enjoined by Him.

**34.** *the morrow shall take thought, &c.*] Rather, *the morrow will have* its own anxieties. The *evil* of the day will thus mean the vexation or trouble of the day, not, as some interpret, the moral evil of imperfect obedience to this command.

[a] Luke 6. 37. Rom. 2. 1.

JUDGE [a]not, that ye be not judged.

2 For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: [b]and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

[b] Mark 4. 24. Luke 6. 38.

3 [c]And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

[c] Luke 6. 41.

4 Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam *is* in thine own eye?

5 Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

6 ¶ Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.

7 ¶ [d]Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you:

[d] ch. 21. 22. Mark 11. 24. Luke 11. 9. John 16. 24. James 1. 5. 6.

8 For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

---

CHAP. VII. 1. *Judge not.*] Commentators have found much difficulty in tracing the connection between these verses and the preceding. Yet it is remarkable that these very verses, however difficult it may be to determine the exact train of thought by which they are introduced, are included also in St. Luke's account of the same discourse (vi. 37, 38, 41, 42), and are thus clearly shown to belong to it. In St. Luke, however, they are introduced immediately after the verses which correspond to the conclusion of ch. v., the whole of chapter vi. being omitted; and this circumstance may perhaps furnish a key to the connection. Ch. vi. we have seen to be connected with the mention of the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees (verse 20). The present verses have a similar connection. In both, the *hypocrisy* of the Scribes and Pharisees is censured, first as regards their ostentation in the performance of good works, and now again as regards their judgments of others as compared with their estimate of themselves. St. Matthew gives both instances. St. Luke omits the first and narrates the second in its logical connection, though not in its actual place in the discourse.

*that ye be not judged.*] The next verse seems clearly to show that these words refer to the divine judgment hereafter, not, as some interpret, to the judgment of men. The doctrine is in fact the same as that of ch. vi. 15, xviii. 35. (Cf. James ii. 13.)

As regards the nature of the sin condemned in this precept, Barrow observes: "It is private, affected, needless, groundless, rash and harsh censuring the persons or actions of our brethren, such as doth resemble, not the acting of a lawful superior, of a needful witness, of a faithful friend, but of a judge acting without competent right, upon no good grounds or in undue manner, which is here interdicted." (Sermon xxii.) The whole sermon is worth consulting as an exposition of this text. (Cf. Rom. xiv. 3, 4; James iv. 11, 12.)

3. *mote.*] The word means literally a dry twig or stalk, as distinguished from the large *beam* of wood. The expression was a Jewish proverb, intimating men's readiness to espy small faults in others while they overlook large ones in themselves. The *eye* here, as in ch. vi. 22, is used figuratively for that moral and spiritual knowledge which is depraved by sin.

6. *Give not that which is holy, &c.*] The transition seems more abrupt than it really is, owing to the change in the person addressed, the rebuke of the hypocrite being followed by a precept to the disciple. The train of thought becomes clearer by connecting this verse with verse 1: "Be not severe in judging others: be not careless in giving holy things to the profane." *That which is holy;*—a figure taken from the meats offered in sacrifice, which would then be treated like unclean flesh torn by beasts (Exod. xx. 22, 31). The latter part of the verse relates exclusively to the swine; the pearls bear some resemblance to peas or acorns, the natural food of swine; the animal is at first deceived by the resemblance and then turns upon the giver. It is perhaps refining too much to regard the "dogs" and the "swine" as types of different classes of profane persons. Both are rather instances of the same precept, not to give holy things to those who are unworthy of them, who will despise the gift and turn against the giver. The best commentary is the language of 2 Pet. ii. 21, 22: "that which is holy" being equivalent to "the holy commandment" there mentioned.

7. *Ask, &c.*] Though God wills not that His gifts should be lightly cast down before those who despise them, He is ready to give

9 Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?

10 Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?

11 If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?

12 Therefore all things [e]whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

[e] Luke 6. 31.

13 ¶ [f]Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad *is* the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat:

[f] Luke 13. 24.

14 [1]Because strait *is* the gate, and narrow *is* the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.

[1] Or, *How*.

15 ¶ Beware of false prophets,

---

them to those who humbly and in faith pray for them. The substance of this and the four following verses is repeated with a different context, Luke xi. 9-13. In that place they are naturally introduced as a sequel to the Lord's Prayer, and if we admit that that prayer was twice given, the repetition of these verses will be admitted. (Also see above on ch. v. 9.)

**9.** *what man.*] The word *man* is emphatic; the love of sinful men to their children being contrasted with that of God.

**11.** *good things.*] St. Luke (xi. 13) gives *the Holy Spirit.* In this change, we may see evidence, not as has been said of "a later form of Christian tradition," but probably of a later and more spiritual teaching addressed to more advanced disciples.

**12.** *Therefore all things, &c.*] These words may be regarded both as an immediate corollary from the preceding verse, and as a summary of the general tenor of the whole discourse. In verse 2 we are told that men will be dealt with by God as they themselves deal with others. Hence the good gifts which God gives to those who ask Him are contingent upon their asking in faith, and upon their conduct to others as the result of that faith. Those only can hope to receive good things from God who are themselves ready to do as they would be done by. And in the mention of the *law and the prophets*, there is a remote reference to that *fulfilment*, or rather *perfecting*, of the law and the prophets (ch. v. 17), which forms the introduction to all the precepts of the sermon. So again we are told (ch. xxii. 40) that on the two commandments, love to God and love to our neighbour, *hang all the law and the prophets*. Parallels to verse 12 have been collected from Jewish and heathen writers, which may be expected as regards a duty discernible by the natural conscience. The peculiarly Christian feature is the connection between this duty and the love of God to man. (See Delitzsch, 'Jesus und Hillel,' p. 19. F. C. C.)

**13.** *Enter ye, &c.*] The discourse having been summed up in verse 12, the following verses contain a further exhortation to follow the precepts contained in it, notwithstanding the impediments arising from their own difficulty or from the seductions of false teachers. The *strait gate* and the *narrow way* probably denote the self-denial required of the followers of Christ and the persecutions to which they are liable to be exposed. (Compare ch. x. 37, 38, xvi. 24; John vii. 7; Acts xiv. 22.)

**15.** *false prophets.*] It has been much disputed whether by the *false prophets* are meant Jewish or Christian teachers, and by their *fruits* false doctrines or evil lives. Perhaps neither distinction should be pressed too closely. The whole discourse relates to the Messiah's kingdom, and the false prophets will naturally mean those who lead men away from that kingdom, whether professing Christians or not. The term will thus include both the false Christs predicted in ch. xxiv. 5, 24, and the wolves foretold by St. Paul as entering into the Church (Acts xx. 29). The latter are more particularly specified in verses 21, 22. There is nothing, however, in the context to suggest strictly Jewish teachers, such as the Scribes and Pharisees, who seem rather excluded by verse 22. In like manner it has been disputed whether by these wolves in sheep's clothing are meant persons of pure lives but unsound doctrine, or those of orthodox doctrine but evil lives. Here again there seems to be no *exclusive* reference to either. The *sheep's clothing* implies the appearance and profession of a religious teacher abused to evil purposes, whether in matters of doctrine or of practice; and the *fruits* by which they are to be known will include whatever is contrary to the teaching of Christ in the one respect or in the other. Teaching as well as practice is included among the fruits of the heart (cf. ch. xii. 32-37; Luke vi. 45; with ch. xv. 18, 19), and it is of false teaching that St. Paul uses similar words (2 Cor. xi. 13-15). The "fruits," therefore, must in-

which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

16 Ye shall know them by their fruits. [g] Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

[g] Luke 6. 43.

17 Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.

18 A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.

19 [h] Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

[h] ch. 3. 10.

20 Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

21 ¶ Not every one that saith unto me, [i] Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

[i] Rom. 2. 13. Jam. 1. 22.

22 Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?

23 And then will I profess unto them, [k] I never knew you: [l] depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

[k] Luke 13. 27. [l] Psal. 6. 8.

24 ¶ Therefore [m] whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock:

[m] Luke 6. 47.

25 And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.

26 And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand:

27 And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.

28 And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, [n] the people were astonished at his doctrine:

[n] Mark 1. 22. Luke 4. 32.

---

clude, not merely the fruits of their lives, but, as Bishop Sanderson says, "the necessary consequence of their doctrines, such conclusions as naturally and by good and evident discourse do issue from their doctrines." (Sanderson's Works, vol. i. p. 244.)

**21.** *the kingdom of heaven.*] Of the two applications of this expression to denote the Church militant on earth and the Church triumphant hereafter (see above on ch. iii. 2, v. 3), it sometimes happens that the one predominates to the exclusion of the other. In the present verse the language is applicable only to the glorified Church which shall reign with Christ hereafter, while in such passages as ch. xiii. 24, it relates in the first instance only to that visible Church in which the evil are mingled with the good. Here the reference is made clear by the mention in the next verse of *that day*, the great day of judgment which is to precede the entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

**22.** *Many shall say.*] In the literal application of this passage to the exercise of miraculous powers in Christ's name, it seems to connect itself naturally with verse 15, and to relate to false teachers in general, not only to cases like that of Judas, to whom, in common with the other Apostles, was given power to cast out devils and to heal sicknesses (ch. x. 1), or to that contemplated as possible by St. Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 2), but also to such as Simon Magus (Acts viii. 13) and the exorcists (Acts xix. 13). But the spirit of the warning extends far beyond the extraordinary cases actually mentioned, and applies to all those in all ages who, whether teachers or hearers, nominally profess Christian doctrine without holiness of life.

**24.** *I will liken him.*] From the use of the future tense, some commentators suppose this simile, like the language of the preceding verse, to be part of our Lord's words in the final judgment. But this interpretation is both improbable in itself and at variance with the language of verse 26: *shall be likened;* and with the use of the present (Luke vi. 47, 49). It is surely more natural to understand the future tense merely as relating to future cases as they arise. Whosoever shall hereafter thus act, the words now spoken will apply to him. It is highly probable indeed from MS authority, that the third person is the true reading in this verse as in verse 26, in which case the only shadow of a ground for the other interpretation disappears.

29 For he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as the scribes.

## CHAPTER VIII.

2 *Christ cleanseth the leper,* 5 *healeth the centurion's servant,* 14 *Peter's mother in law,* 16 *and many other diseased:* 18 *sheweth how he is to be followed:* 23 *stilleth the tempest on the sea,* 28 *driveth the devils out of two men possessed,* 31 *and suffereth them to go into the swine.*

WHEN he was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed him.

2 [a] And, behold, there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.

[a] Mark 1. 40. Luke 5. 12

3 And Jesus put forth *his* hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed.

4 And Jesus saith unto him, See

---

**29.** *as one having authority, &c.*] Christ taught in His own name, with the authority of a lawgiver—*I say unto you.* The Scribes taught merely as interpreters of the law of Moses. The Scribes (at least the persons so called in the New Testament: the name itself is of earlier use, but probably in another sense) were a body of professional students and teachers of the Law, whose occupation consisted partly in multiplying copies of the Law, partly in expounding it. In this sense the Scribes seem to have been called into existence as a body at the time of the return from the captivity, when the institutions of the Law had become forgotten by disuse in a foreign country. In this sense Ezra is the first person known by the name of "the Scribe;" and others seem to have been appointed by him to teach the Law to the people (Neh. viii. 8, 12). These at first, as was natural, were chiefly selected from the priests and Levites (Neh. viii. 9; Hag. ii. 11), though not confined to them. (See note on ch. ii. 4.) Afterwards the Scribes became a regularly organised college into which members were admitted by special examination. The Scribes are also called *Lawyers,* a term used chiefly by St. Luke. The attempt to establish a distinction between the Scribes and Lawyers as different classes cannot be maintained, and is not supported by the true reading of Luke xi. 44. It is possible, however, that the former may have been the official, the latter the popular name, of the same persons.

CHAP. VIII.—1-4. THE LEPER HEALED.

**1.** *When he was come down, &c.*] There is here a discrepancy between the three synoptical Evangelists. St. Mark gives no exact note of time, but records it *after* the healing of Peter's wife's mother. St. Luke places the scene *in a certain city* (which is implied also in Mark i. 45, where see note), and records it immediately after the call of the four disciples, and *before* the Sermon on the Mount. From the absence of any positive statement of time by the two latter Evangelists, and the existence of the apparent one here, some have concluded that the event really took place as here mentioned, after He had come down from the mount, and immediately before the healing of the centurion's servant, which is placed by St. Luke next after the Sermon. It is possible, however, to adopt the order of the other Evangelists, if we connect verse 1 alone of this chapter with the preceding, and suppose verse 2 to commence a new subject not stated in chronological order. It may be observed that this is the first miracle separately related by St. Matthew (those of ch. iv. 23, 24, being only general enumerations), and it is usual for this Evangelist to group together events of the same kind, though not connected with each other in point of time. This may account for the mention of this miracle, together with others of the same kind, verses 5, 14, even if it took place at a different time. According to this view, verse 1 ought to be included in the previous chapter, the present commencing at verse 2.

**2.** *a leper.*] Probably one totally leprous, who was considered as clean (Levit. xiii. 13). He is called *full of leprosy,* Luke v. 12. One partially leprous was required to dwell alone (Levit. xiii. 45, 46). On the nature of leprosy, and the signification of the ordinances relating to it, see Trench on the Miracles, No. 10, and note in this Commentary on Leviticus.

**3.** *I will.*] Our Lord speaks in His own name, and as working miracles by His own power. Compare the opposite language of St. Peter (Acts iii. 13). So, too, He is able to touch the leper without ceremonial defilement.

**4.** *See thou tell no man.*] Probably for the same reason for which He suffered not the unclean spirits to proclaim their knowledge of Him (Mark i. 34), and withdrew himself from those who would make Him a king (John vi. 15). It was not His purpose to announce Himself publicly as the Messiah,

thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that [p] Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

[p] Lev. 14. 4.

5 ¶ [q] And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion, beseeching him,

[q] Luke 7. 1.

6 And saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented.

7 And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him.

8 The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.

9 For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this *man*, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth *it*.

10 When Jesus heard *it*, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

11 And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.

12 But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

13 And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, *so* be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour.

14 ¶ [r] And when Jesus was come

[r] Mark 1. 29.

---

so as to raise the popular expectation of a temporal prince.

*for a testimony unto them.*] The offering was a testimony not to the priest but to the people, to teach them that the leper was pronounced clean (see Levit. xiv. 57). And this is probably the meaning here, *unto them* being referred back to *tell no man.*

5-13. THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.

**5.** This healing is narrated with more detail by St. Luke. There is no discrepancy between the accounts, though St. Matthew's abridged statement omits the circumstance that the centurion's application was made through others. That the centurion was a Gentile by birth appears from verse 10, and from Luke vii. 5. He may possibly have been a proselyte, but this does not appear from the narrative; indeed, verses 11, 12, seem rather to intimate the contrary, though his having built the synagogue and his intimacy with the Jewish elders, shew at least a favourable disposition towards the Jewish people and their religion. The existence at this time of the persons who are called in rabbinical writings Proselytes of the Gate is very doubtful. See note at the end of chapter xxiii.

**9.** *For I am a man under authority, &c.*] Being myself under authority, I know what it is to obey: having soldiers under me, I know how they obey my commands. I know, then, from my own experience, that the powers of disease which are under Thy command will obey Thy word.

**11.** *And I say unto you, &c.*] These words are omitted in St. Luke's account, but similar words occur with another context, Luke xiii. 28, 29. The thought, however, of the two passages is different, and they clearly were spoken on two distinct occasions. In the present passage our Lord is contrasting the strangers by birth, the Gentiles, with the children of the kingdom, the Jews, to whom the Messiah was especially promised. In St. Luke the contrast is between the righteous and the wicked, without reference to nationality.

**14.** The arrangement of St. Matthew is not chronological. The day after the healing of the centurion's servant follows the raising of the widow's son at Nain (Luke vii. 11), to which probably succeed in order the various events recorded by St. Luke, from vii. 18 to viii. 3. After these, the probable order is that of St. Mark (iii. 20, where see note, to vi. 56), who omits all the above incidents, but continues the narrative from the events immediately preceding to those immediately following, viz., from the call of the Apostles, which, with the Sermon on the Mount, immediately preceded the healing of the centurion's servant, to the events of our Lord's journey through Galilee, introduced by St. Luke, viii. 1-3. On the other hand, the healing of Peter's wife's mother is placed by St. Mark and St. Luke immediately after the cure of the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum, and some time before the Sermon on the Mount. St. Mark,

Luke 4. 38.

into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever.

15 And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and ministered unto them.

[a] Mark 1. 32. Luke 4. 40.

16 ¶ [a] When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with *his* word, and healed all that were sick:

17 That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, [a] Himself took our infirmities, and bare *our* sicknesses.

[a] Isaiah 53. 4. 1 Pet. 2. 24.

18 ¶ Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him, he gave commandment to depart unto the other side.

19 [b] And a certain scribe came, and said unto him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.

[b] Luke 9. 57.

---

however, places it after, St. Luke before, the call of Peter and Andrew and James and John. It is natural, however, to conclude that St. Luke has postponed his account of the latter event, because in ch. iv. he is narrating consecutively various events on sabbath days, first at Nazareth and then at Capernaum, after which he returns to an intermediate event on an ordinary day. (See Blunt's 'Undesigned Coincidences,' p. 248.) The probable chronological order will be (1) the teaching at Nazareth and its consequences (narrated Luke iv. 16, alluded to Matt. iv. 13); (2) the call of the four disciples, after our Lord had left Nazareth and taken up his abode at Capernaum (Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 16, narrated out of its order, Luke v. 1); (3) the preaching at Capernaum and healing of the demoniac (Mark i. 21; Luke iv. 31); (4) the healing of Peter's wife's mother, immediately after leaving the synagogue (Mark i. 29; Luke iv. 38). St. Matthew probably narrates this last event, together with the healing of the centurion's servant, on account of their both taking place at Capernaum, though at different times.

*Peter's house.*] St. Peter was a native of Bethsaida (John i. 44), but it is clear from this narrative, and still more from the parallel places, that he was at this time resident at Capernaum.

**16.** *when the even was come.*] The healing of Peter's wife's mother took place on the Sabbath. See Mark i. 21-29. The people, therefore, did not bring their sick till the evening, when the Sabbath was over. St. Matthew, who does not mention the Sabbath, yet incidentally confirms St. Mark's account, by mentioning the evening. See the remarks in Blunt's 'Undesigned Coincidences,' Part iv. § 6.

**17.** *Himself took our infirmities, &c.*] Translated from the Hebrew more closely than by the LXX version. The words in the original may be rendered as in the Authorised Version "he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows," or, as the Evangelist here renders, "our bodily diseases;" though the former seems to be the leading idea according to the context. But the words chosen by St. Matthew, *Himself took, &c.*, preclude the supposition that he refers the prophet's words, contrary to the sense of the original, to the mere *removal* of diseases by healing them. They manifestly imply that Christ in some sense removed these diseases by bearing them in His own person; as indeed Isaiah says, "with His stripes we are healed." The thought of the Evangelist, therefore, seems to be that our Lord, by assuming a human nature, and becoming subject to the bodily sufferings of men, was enabled to manifest Himself as the healer of suffering in others, a healing which was typical of that higher deliverance to which the words are applied by St. Peter (more nearly according to the LXX), "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body" (1 Pet. ii. 24).

18–34. THE DEPARTURE, THE STORM, AND THE DEMONIAC OF GERGESA.

**18.** *Now when Jesus saw, &c.*] That the following verses are not chronologically connected with the preceding, appears from St. Mark iv. 35, where the stilling of the tempest is said to have taken place on the evening of the same day with the delivery of sundry parables. In fact, the whole of the remainder of this chapter including the two consecutive events of the stilling of the tempest, and the casting out of the legion of devils, belongs to a later period of our Lord's ministry. The true position of the intermediate verses in this chapter, verses 19-22, is more difficult to assign. St. Luke (ix. 57) records the same occurrences as taking place during a journey to Jerusalem, probably that to the Feast of Tabernacles about six months before His Crucifixion, and the words of Luke ix. 58 are very appropriate to the context after our Lord had been refused admission into the Samaritan village. It is quite possible that verses 19, 20 of the present chapter may relate to a different event, the person here being specially designated as a scribe. In that case, verse 21 may have

20 And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air *have* nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay *his* head.

21 And another of his disciples said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father.

22 But Jesus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead.

23 ¶ And when he was entered into a ship, his disciples followed him.

24 [c] And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves: but he was asleep.

[c] Mark 4. 37. Luke 8. 23.

25 And his disciples came to *him*, and awoke him, saying, Lord, save us: we perish.

26 And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm.

27 But the men marvelled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!

28 ¶ [d] And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way.

[d] Mark 5. 1. Luke 8. 26.

---

been joined to it from similarity of subject, though belonging to a different time. (See Greswell, 'Diss.' i. p. 201; Ellicott, 'Lect.' p. 250; Krafft, 'Chronol. u. Harm.' p. 107.)

**20.** *the Son of man.*] This expression, so frequently used by our Lord of Himself, is undoubtedly taken from Dan. vii. 13, and is intended to signify that He is that Messiah whom Daniel saw in his vision coming with the clouds of heaven. The name, as thus applied, denotes both His human Messiahship and His divine pre-existence.

**22.** *let the dead bury their dead.*] *I.e.*, let those who are spiritually dead, who have received no call to follow Christ, bury those who are naturally dead. From Luke ix. 59, it appears that this man had received a special command to follow Christ; and the answer was thus a trial of his faith and obedience. He was placed under the same law as the High Priest and the Nazarites consecrated to God, who were not allowed to touch a dead body or to make themselves unclean for their kindred (Levit. xxi. 10, 11; Numb. vi. 6, 7).

**23.** *And when he was entered, &c.*] The parable of the sower, and the other parables related, Mark iv. 1-32, seem to have been spoken on this occasion from the ship, before crossing the lake. In the evening (Mark iv. 35) our Lord crossed to the other side, stilling the tempest during the passage.

**28.** *the Gergesenes.*] If this is the true reading (and there is much to be said in its favour) we may, perhaps, identify Gergesa with the modern *Kerza* or *Gersa*, about midway on the eastern shore of the lake. (See Thomson, 'The Land and the Book,' p. 375, ed. 1864.) The same explanation may, perhaps, be given to the reading *Gerasenes*. Gadara lies considerably to the S.E. of the lake, with a deep river between, and is too distant to have been the scene of the miracle, and the Arabian or Peræan Gerasa lies much further to the S.E., among the mountains of Gilead. If we retain the received text in all the three places, the apparent discrepancy admits of a very simple explanation. St. Matthew, who was probably personally acquainted with the locality, and who is writing for Jews, names the exact spot. St. Mark and St. Luke, probably less familiar with the country, and writing for Gentiles, name only generally the region about the well-known Gadara: but see note on Mark v. i.

*two possessed with devils.*] St. Mark and St. Luke name only one. Yet St. Matthew seems to have been more exactly acquainted with the circumstances of the miracle (see the last note), and might, probably, himself have been an eye-witness of it. It is remarkable, however, that he omits the circumstance narrated by the other two Evangelists, that the man who was healed was bidden to publish the great things that had been done unto him. Is it not possible that this man's narrative, speaking of himself alone, may have been the source of the later account, while that of St. Matthew was derived from his own witness, and this includes the second sufferer, who disappears from the subsequent tale of his companion?

*coming out of the tombs.*] These tombs were caverns, natural or artificial, in the sides of the rocks, containing cells in which the dead bodies were placed and closed up. The entrance to the cave itself was not closed; and thus it might be used as a habitation.

29 And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?

30 And there was a good way off from them an herd of many swine feeding.

31 So the devils besought him, saying, If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine.

32 And he said unto them, Go. And when they were come out, they went into the herd of swine: and, behold, the whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters.

33 And they that kept them fled, and went their ways into the city, and told everything, and what was befallen to the possessed of the devils.

34 And, behold, the whole city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought *him* that he would depart out of their coasts.

## CHAPTER IX.

2 *Christ curing one sick of the palsy,* 9 *calleth Matthew from the receipt of custom,* 10 *eateth with publicans and sinners,* 14 *defendeth his disciples for not fasting,* 20 *cureth the bloody issue,* 23 *raiseth from death Jairus' daughter,* 27 *giveth sight to two blind men,* 32 *healeth a dumb man possessed of a devil,* 36 *and hath compassion of the multitude.*

---

Such ancient tombs still exist in the hills above Gersa, as well as at Gadara; indeed the whole region, as Mr. Tristram remarks, is so perforated with these rock-chambers, that a home for the demoniac might be found, whatever locality be assigned as the scene of the miracle.

29. *before the time.*] *I.e.*, before the final judgment.

32. *perished in the waters.*] The objections raised against this destruction on so-called moral grounds, have been well met in Archbishop Trench's 'Notes on the Miracles.' It may be, that this permission helped the cure of the man; and a man is of more value than many swine. And even if we suppose, as is very possible, that the owners of the swine were Gentiles, as was a great part of the population of this region—a supposition which excludes the idea of punishment for despising the Mosaic Law—still there is no more ground for cavil in the permitted destruction of the swine by the evil spirits, than in a similar destruction by murrain or other natural causes.

34. *besought him that he would depart.*] Not from humility as St. Peter (Luke v. 8), but from anger at the loss of their property and fear of further loss.

Concerning the true character of demoniacal possession, the admirable remarks of Archbishop Trench, in his Note on this miracle, should be consulted. The present case may be regarded as the crucial instance by which all the others may be tested. In the first place, no theory of natural lunacy or epilepsy can account for the recorded facts. The entry into the swine is conclusive on this point. See note on ch. iv. 24. In the second place the various attempts which have been made to dilute the narrative into a misrepresentation of natural occurrences (such, *e.g.*, as that the maniac himself drove the swine into the water, or that he uttered a cry which terrified them, or that the loss of the swine was a contemporaneous accident), are simply awkward modes of rejecting the history as untrue. The real alternative lies between accepting the narrative as a veritable history, and rejecting it altogether as mythical or fabulous. In the third place, it should be noted that our Lord Himself distinctly recognises these cases as veritable instances of possession by evil spirits; and that in such a manner that to take the opposite view is to impugn His knowledge or His truth. He does so, not merely openly to the sufferers themselves, but also in His confidential discourses to His disciples (see Matt. xvii. 21; Mark ix. 29). In the fourth place, we may observe the distinction, everywhere remarkable, between this class of miracles and all other cases of our Lord's miraculous healing of disease. The hatred and horror manifested by the evil spirits towards Him: the stern words of rebuke, with no mixture of compassion, employed by Him towards them; the terrible convulsions marking the effect of His presence upon them; all these indicate a conflict between the Powers of good and evil of a different kind from anything that appears in Christ's intercourse with sin and suffering in its properly human form. To those who believe that He was the Son of God, manifested to destroy the works of the devil, this permitted conflict contains nothing incongruous or incredible. Those who do not believe this are only consistent in rejecting the whole series of these miracles as fictitious.

AND he entered into a ship, and passed over, and came into his own city.

2 [e]And, behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.

Mark 2. 3. Luke 5. 18.

3 And, behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This *man* blasphemeth.

4 And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?

5 For whether is easier, to say, *Thy* sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk?

6 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house.

7 And he arose, and departed to his house.

8 But when the multitudes saw *it*, they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men.

9 ¶ [f]And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him.

f Mark 2. 14. Luke 5. 27.

---

CHAP. IX.—1–26. RETURN TO CAPERNAUM, AND EVENTS IN THAT CITY.

1. *And he entered into a ship, &c.*] This verse should be placed at the end of the preceding chapter, as being properly connected with the previous narrative. That our Lord returned to the other side of the lake immediately after the request of the people that He would depart from them, is stated by St. Mark and St. Luke (Mark v. 21; Luke viii. 40); but the event which immediately followed His return, according to both these Evangelists, is not the cure of the paralytic, but the raising of the daughter of Jairus.

*his own city.*] Capernaum, which our Lord had chosen for His residence after leaving Nazareth; see ch. iv. 13. This expression (ἡ ἰδία πόλις) must be distinguished from *his country* (ἡ πατρὶς αὐτοῦ), which is applied to Nazareth, ch. xiii. 54. Cf. Mark vi. 1.

2. *And, behold, &c.*] The healing of the paralytic took place at Capernaum (see Mark ii. 1), not however on this occasion, but considerably earlier. The narrative is introduced here by the same words as that of the leper (ch. viii. 2) which is also related out of its chronological order. It is noticeable that these two events, thus introduced by St. Matthew, come close to each other in the narratives of St. Mark and St. Luke.

*seeing their faith.*] As manifested by the additional circumstance (mentioned Mark ii. 4; Luke v. 19) of their uncovering the roof of the house to bring the sick man in.

*thy sins be forgiven thee.*] This may possibly imply that the disease of this man was the special consequence of sin, and that the forgiveness of the cause was to precede the removal of the effect; but this is by no means certain. It is clear, however, that our Lord, by the same divine power by which He knew the thoughts of the scribes, knew the state of the paralytic's heart, and therefore pronounced his forgiveness.

5. *For whether is easier.*] "He does not ask, 'Which is easiest, to forgive sins or to raise a sick man?' for it could not be affirmed that the act of forgiving was easier than that of healing; but 'Which is easiest, to claim this power, or to claim that;' *to say*, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee,' or to say, 'Arise and walk?' And He then proceeds, 'That is easiest, and I will now prove my right to say it, by saying with effect and with an outward consequence setting its seal to my truth, the harder word, *Rise up and walk.*'" (Abp. Trench.)

6. *power on earth.*] "In the words, *power on earth*, there lies a tacit opposition to 'power in heaven.' This power is not exercised, as you deem, only by God in heaven, but also by the Son of man upon earth. You rightly assert that it is only exercised by Him who dwelleth in the heavens; but He, who in the person of the Son of man, has descended also upon earth, has also brought it down with Him here." (*Ibid.*)

9. The call of Matthew may be clearly identified with that narrated by St. Mark and St. Luke with the name of Levi. Both are publicans, and the call of each is narrated after the same event, the cure of the paralytic; and each event is followed by the feast in the publican's house. It is probable that the Apostle's original name was Levi, and that, like St. Peter, he received a new name on his call—Matthew or Mattathias, "the gift of

10 ¶ And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples.

11 And when the Pharisees saw *it*, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?

12 But when Jesus heard *that*, he said unto them, They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.

13 But go ye and learn what *that* meaneth, [g] I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, [h] but sinners to repentance.

[g] Hos. 6. 6. ch. 12. 7.

[h] 1 Tim. 1. 15.

14 ¶ Then came to him the disciples of John, saying, [i] Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?

[i] Mark 2. 18. Luke 5. 33.

15 And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast.

---

the Lord." It has been remarked that St. Matthew alone of the Synoptists uses the name of Peter by anticipation before it was actually conferred. (See note on Mark iii. 16.) He may possibly have done the same with his own name. In like manner it has been remarked that St. Paul in his Epistles always speaks of himself by his later name. It may be observed also that the expression here used, "A man *named* Matthew," is one frequently used by the Evangelist when the name thus introduced is a second name. (Cf. ch. i. 16, iv. 18, x. 2, xxvi. 3 (the proper name of Caiaphas being Joseph); xxvi. 14.)

**10.** *in the house.*] *I.e.* in Matthew's house, as is manifest from Luke v. 29. "How natural" says Professor Blunt, "for a man, speaking of a transaction which concerned himself, to forget for a moment the character of the historian, and to talk of Jesus sitting down in *the* house, without telling his readers whose house it was. How natural for him not to perceive that there was vagueness and obscurity in a term which to himself was definite and plain."

**11.** *when the Pharisees saw it.*] It is not probable that the Pharisees would themselves be present at such a feast, but they may have seen Jesus leaving the house with the other guests. The word rendered *saw* may merely mean *knew*, and the conversation may have taken place some time after the feast. And this may be a possible explanation of the chronological difficulty noticed at the end of this chapter.

**13.** *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.*] Neither here nor in the original words of Hosea is sacrifice, which is God's ordinance, in itself condemned, but only when it takes the place of higher duties (cf. ch. xxiii. 23). The meaning of the citation here, as in ch. xii. 7, is to rebuke the Pharisees for valuing ceremonial observances more than the salvation of sinners, or charity towards their fellow men. By showing them to be in this respect transgressors of God's law, our Lord convicts them of being sinners, as well as the publicans whom they despised.

*the righteous.*] Not those who esteem themselves righteous, as the Pharisees; for such have much need of the call to repentance, and this interpretation hardly suits the parallel of the whole and the sick. The argument is sufficiently clear in its natural sense; the greater a man's sin, the more need he has of the call to repentance; as, if he were perfectly righteous, he would need no repentance. These words do not, of course, imply that any man is perfectly righteous, nor is such a supposition necessary to the reasoning.

**14.** *Then came to him, &c.*] In St. Mark the speakers are mentioned indefinitely, and without any note of time: "they come and say unto him." St. Luke's language in the original seems to imply the same speakers as before, *i.e.* the Scribes and Pharisees, or at least some of the company present at the previous question. The latter interpretation is quite consistent with the account of St. Matthew, whose more precise language possibly indicates his own presence on the occasion. It will be observed that our Lord's answer has a peculiar propriety as addressed to the disciples of John, who had himself spoken of Jesus as the Bridegroom. See John iii. 29. On the chronological difficulty connected with these incidents, see note at the end of the chapter.

**15.** *the children of the bridechamber.*] *I.e.* the groomsmen or friends of the bridegroom (cf. Judges xiv. 11), who accompanied him to the house of the bride, to escort her to her new home. This was succeeded by a feast (Matt. xxii. 4; Luke xiv. 8; John ii. 8, 9), and was therefore a time most opposed to

[1] Or, raw, or, unwrought cloth.

16 No man putteth a piece of [1]new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse.

17 Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.

[k] Mark 5. 22. Luke 8. 41.

18 ¶ [k]While he spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler, and worshipped him, saying, My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.

19 And Jesus arose, and followed him, and *so did* his disciples.

20 ¶ And, behold, a woman, which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind *him*, and touched the hem of his garment:

21 For she said within herself, If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole.

22 But Jesus turned him about, and when he saw her, he said, Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole. And the woman was made whole from that hour.

23 And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the minstrels and the people making a noise,

24 He said unto them, Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn.

25 But when the people were put forth, he went in, and took her by the hand, and the maid arose.

26 And [1]the fame hereof went abroad into all that land.

[1] Or, this fame.

27 ¶ And when Jesus departed thence, two blind men followed him, crying, and saying, *Thou* son of David, have mercy on us.

28 And when he was come into

---

fasting and mourning. The words *the bridegroom shall be taken from them* are the first allusion to His own death made by our Lord in this Gospel.

**16.** *No man putteth a piece of new cloth, &c.*] The meaning of both the following similitudes is obviously the same. The new life of Christianity cannot be adapted to the old forms of Judaism. This does not exclude Christianity from having its own rites and ceremonies, its own fasts and festivals; but they must be such as correspond to the distinctive character of Christianity. The piece of new undressed cloth by its weight and strength will tear the old web to which it is attached. The new wine fermenting, will burst the old leathern bottles, which are too weak to hold it. The additional words of St. Luke v. 39 do not conflict with this interpretation; the old wine still represents Judaism and the new Christianity; and the meaning is that one trained in and devoted to the forms of the old religion, will be unable to appreciate the spirit of the new. The old is not better in itself, but better in his estimation. The other interpretation, which regards the disciples as the old garment, &c., which cannot at once bear the new religion in its completeness, is far less natural.

**18.** *a certain ruler.*] Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue, see Mark v. 22; Luke viii. 41. The exact position of the officer thus designated is uncertain. The synagogues were generally governed by a college of elders (πρεσβύτεροι, Luke vii. 3), under a president specially designated as the *ruler of the Synagogue* (Luke xiii. 14; Acts xviii. 8). This term, however, is also used in the plural number, probably of the whole body (Mark v. 22; Acts xiii. 15). Notwithstanding the name of *elders*, it seems that young men were admissible to the body, the *young man* of Matt. xix. 20 being called a *ruler*, Luke xviii. 18.

*even now dead.*] She was not yet actually dead, but on the point of death: see Mark v. 23. St. Matthew, who omits the subsequent message from the ruler's house, gives the account in a succinct form, anticipating the mention of her actual death. The healing of the woman in the following verses is also narrated succinctly here, and more fully in St. Mark (where see notes), and St. Luke.

**24.** *is not dead, but sleepeth.*] Not literally *sleepeth;* but her death is only, as it were, a sleep from which she is soon to awake. So it is said of Lazarus, John xi. 11.

### 27–38. Works and Preaching in Galilee.

**27.** *two blind men.*] This and probably the following miracle are related only by St. Matthew. Two blind men are subse-

the house, the blind men came to him: and Jesus saith unto them, Believe ye that I am able to do this? They said unto him, Yea, Lord.

29 Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you.

30 And their eyes were opened; and Jesus straitly charged them, saying, See *that* no man know *it*.

31 But they, when they were departed, spread abroad his fame in all that country.

32 ¶ [a] As they went out, behold, they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil.

33 And when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake: and the multitudes marvelled, saying, It was never so seen in Israel.

34 But the Pharisees said, [b] He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils.

35 [c] And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people.

36 ¶ [d] But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they [1] fainted, and were scattered abroad, [e] as sheep having no shepherd.

37 Then saith he unto his disciples, [f] The harvest truly *is* plenteous, but the labourers *are* few;

38 Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest.

[a] Luke 11. 14.
[b] ch. 12. 24. Mark 3. 22. Luke 11. 15.
[c] Mark 6. 6. Luke 13. 22.
[d] Mark 6. 34.
[1] Or, *were tired and lay down*.
[e] Num. 27. 17.
[f] Luke 10. 2.

---

quently healed at Jericho (Matt. xx. 30; cf. Mark x. 46; Luke xviii. 35), and a demoniac under similar circumstances to the present case (Matt. xii. 22; Luke xi. 14). Both these parallel cases, however, are repeated by the same Evangelist as distinct occurrences. It has been a matter of considerable discussion, however, whether the case of the dumb demoniac (Luke xi. 14) is identical with the present miracle or with that of ch. xii. 22. The similarity of details is in favour of the latter supposition, but the chronology of the narrative may perhaps be more easily arranged on the former. Krafft ('Chronologie u. Harmonie,' p. 85) argues at length in favour of the former view. He regards the present chapter as a brief narrative of our Lord's acts, while ch. xii. relates the mode in which He was received by the people, under which view events of different dates are coupled together. He regards the narrative of ch. xii. 38-45 as chronologically belonging to this place, but transferred in accordance with the above design. A similar view is taken by Tischendorf, 'Synopsis Evangelica,' § 47. But on the whole it seems better to adopt the other view than to detach the present passage so far from the period to which it certainly seems to belong. Cf. Bp. Ellicott, 'Hist. Lect.,' p. 258.

36. *But when he saw the multitudes.*] These verses should be included in the following chapter, being an introduction to the sending out of the Twelve, just as similar words are used on the sending out of the Seventy, Luke x. 2.

---

## NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF CHAP. IX.

There is considerable difficulty in the arrangement of the events narrated in this chapter. The narrative from verse 2 to verse 9 inclusive can hardly be regarded as other than continuous, the same events being narrated in the same order by St. Mark and St. Luke. Again, the notes of time at verses 14, 18, 27, 32, seem to shew that the events from verse 10 to verse 34 are regarded by St. Matthew as occurring consecutively; and moreover, if the Evangelist be the same person as Matthew the publican, in his own presence as a witness. But the narrative of St. Mark and St. Luke seems to require that verses 18-26 should follow immediately after the end of ch. viii., and that verses 2-17 should be placed at a much earlier period. Yet it is between verse 17 and verse 18 that the temporal succession is most strongly marked, and hinders us from taking refuge in the usually unchronological arrangement of St. Matthew's narrative. The only place at which it seems possible to suppose a break in the series is between verses 9 and 10; and perhaps the

least violent explanation is to suppose that the feast in Matthew's house did not immediately follow his call, but that the two events, from their connection with the same person, were grouped together in an original narrative, oral or written, which in this case has been followed by all the three Evangelists. On this supposition, the cure of the paralytic and the call of Matthew will properly come where they are placed by St. Mark and St. Luke; while the subsequent discourses belong to the later series of events, immediately preceding the raising of the daughter of Jairus. Thus in St. Matthew the account of his own call and the preceding cure is postponed by attraction, as it were, to the later discourses in his house, while in the other Evangelists the discourses are anticipated by a similar attraction to the call.

---

## CHAPTER X.

1 *Christ sendeth out his twelve apostles, enabling them with power to do miracles,* 5 *giveth them their charge, teacheth them,* 16 *comforteth them against persecutions:* 40 *and promiseth a blessing to those that receive them.*

AND [g] when he had called unto *him* his twelve disciples, he gave them power [1] *against* unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease.

[g] Mark 3. 14. Luke 9. 1.
[1] Or, over.

2 Now the names of the twelve apostles are these; The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James *the son* of Zebedee, and John his brother;

3 Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James *the son* of Alphæus, and Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus;

---

CHAP. X.—1-16. THE MISSION OF THE APOSTLES.

1. *And when he had called, &c.*] This is the first mission of the Twelve as preachers of the Gospel, parallel to Mark vi. 7; Luke ix. 1. The names of the apostles are given by St. Mark and St. Luke in connection with their first appointment. Cf. Mark iii. 14-19; Luke vi. 13-16. Callings of five out of the Twelve have been mentioned by St. Matthew previously; see ch. iv. 18, 21, ix. 9.

2. *apostles.*] This name is now mentioned for the first time as the proper designation of those disciples who were especially *sent out* as teachers. It was a name given by our Lord Himself, either now or on the occasion of their previous selection, Luke vi. 13. It is sometimes applied to other persons besides the Twelve, as in 2 Cor. viii. 23; Philip. ii. 25 (in both which places it is rendered *messenger*); possibly also (though here the interpretation is doubtful) Romans xvi. 7.

*Simon, who is called Peter.*] Or, *Cephas*, both names having the same signification, the one in Greek, the other in Aramaic. For the occasion on which this name was first applied, see John i. 42. It would seem, however, from Mark iii. 16, that the name mentioned by anticipation on Peter's first meeting with our Lord was not given as his usual appellation till his appointment as an apostle. It has been observed that St. Mark and St. Luke always employ the name of Simon before this period, and that of Peter after it, whereas St. Matthew, who does not mention the first appointment of the Twelve, uses the name of Peter from the first. Compare Matt. iv. 18 with Mark i. 16; Luke v. 3. See Greswell's 'Dissertations,' vol. ii. p. 44.

3. *Bartholomew.*] *The son of Tolmai*, or *Talmai* (cf. Josh. xv. 14; 2 Sam. xiii. 37; Joseph. 'Ant.' xx. 1, § 1); a patronymic, not a proper name. He was probably the same as Nathanael, who appears from John xxi. 2 to have been one of the Twelve, and who is mentioned in conjunction with Philip (John i. 45) as Bartholomew is in the present and other lists of the Apostles.

*Matthew the publican.*] It is only in St. Matthew's own list that this epithet is annexed to his name, identifying him with the person mentioned in ch. ix. 9. In the other lists he is placed before Thomas; here, after him.

*James the son of Alphæus.*] On the identity of the names *Alphæus* and *Clopas* (two Greek forms of one and the same Aramæan name *Chalphai*) see Dr. Mill's 'Observations,' p. 236. Thus Mary the mother of James the less (Mark xv. 40) is called the wife of Clopas (see note on John xix. 25), while the father is here called by the other form of his name, *Alphæus*. On the question of the identity of this James with James the Lord's brother, see on ch. xiii. 55.

*Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus.*] He is called Thaddæus alone by St. Mark, and corresponds to "Judas [the brother] of

4 Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.

5 These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into *any* city of the Samaritans enter ye not:

6 [h] But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

[h] Acts 13. 46.

7 And as ye go, preach, saying, [i] The kingdom of heaven is at hand.

[i] Luke 10. 9.

8 Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give.

9 [k][1] Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses,

[k] Mark 6. 8. Luke 9. 3. & 22. 35.

[1] Or, *Get.*

10 Nor scrip for *your* journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor

---

James" in St. Luke's two lists (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13). Of the two names Lebbæus and Thaddæus various interpretations have been given; perhaps the most commonly received is that which regards them as words of cognate signification (hearty), given to distinguish this Judas from the traitor. Another, perhaps preferable, interpretation is that which regards Thaddæus as another form of the name Judas. If this Judas is identified with Jude the writer of the Epistle, the ellipsis denoting his relationship to James must be supplied, as in our version, by the word *brother* (see Jude i.), and his brother James may be most naturally understood as the James just before mentioned by St. Luke, the son of Alphæus. This conclusion seems unavoidable if James the son of Alphæus is identical with James the Lord's brother. See on ch. xiii. 55.

**4.** *Simon the Canaanite.*] Not a person of Canaan, as in ch. xv. 22, which is expressed by a different word in the original, but as St. Luke calls him, Zelotes, "the zealot;" the word Κανανίτης or Καναναῖος (not Χαναναῖος), being formed from a Hebrew or Chaldean root having the same meaning. Simon may possibly have belonged to the party of the zealots before his conversion. From his position in St. Luke's list between James and Jude, it has been conjectured that he was a third brother; but this is by no means clear.

*Iscariot.*] Probably *a man of Kerioth*, a city of the tribe of Judah (see Josh. xv. 25). In St. John's gospel he is further described as "Judas Iscariot the son of Simon" (vi. 71, xiii. 2, 26). Other derivations of the name are suggested by Lightfoot, one from his wearing a *leathern apron* containing the purse; another from his death by *strangulation;* but these are less generally received.

**5.** *and commanded them.*] These injunctions of our Lord to the Twelve present features resembling those of the Sermon on the Mount, namely, that they are given in an abbreviated form by the other Evangelists, and that portions of them are found elsewhere with a different context. In this case, however, as in the other, it is manifest that St. Matthew regards the whole as a single discourse (see ch. xi. 1); and on this point he is an immediate witness as one of the Twelve. The special parallels will be noticed in their places.

**5-8.** *Go not . . . . give.*] This portion is peculiar to St. Matthew, and so manifestly belongs to this place as to confirm the belief that the Evangelist has not combined together different discourses, but only given a fuller report of one.

**5.** *the Samaritans.*] These words mark the earlier mission of the Apostles to the Jews alone, as contrasted with their later mission, after our Lord's resurrection, to teach all nations. The Samaritans, who are here coupled with the Gentiles, were almost entirely of heathen descent (cf. Luke xvii. 18). They were the descendants of the nations imported into Samaria by the king of Assyria (2 Kings xvii. 24), probably with little, if any, mixture of Israelitish blood, except such as might subsequently be derived from a few fugitive Jews, such as Manasseh, the founder of the temple on Gerizim. On this point, see Trench on the Parables, p. 310. The later Samaritans claimed indeed a descent from Jacob (John iv. 12), but apparently with but little foundation.

**9-11.** *Provide . . . . thence.*] This portion is in substance common to the three Evangelists, and is also partially repeated by St. Luke in relating the injunctions to the Seventy. The slight discrepancy as regards the staff (Mark vi. 8, where see note) must be allowed as a verbal variation not affecting the substantial agreement of the accounts. Even this slight discrepancy might be explained, as far as St. Matthew and St. Mark alone are concerned, by distinguishing, as some have done, between *provide* (procure expressly) and *take;* but this explanation will not apply to St. Luke, who uses the same word as St. Mark.

**10.** *neither shoes.*] There is no discrepancy between these words and those repeated in St. Mark, *be shod with sandals*. That *shoes* are not the same as *sandals* is shown by Lightfoot on this place. The former were a

[l Luke 10. 7. 1 Tim. 5. 18.] yet staves: [l]for the workman is worthy of his meat.

[m Luke 10. 8.] 11 [m]And into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence.

12 And when ye come into an house, salute it.

13 And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you.

[n Mark 6. 11.] 14 [n]And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, [o]shake off the dust of your feet. [o Acts 13. 51.]

15 Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city.

16 ¶ [p]Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and [1]harmless as doves. [p Luke 10. 3.] [1 Or, *simple*.]

17 But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues;

---

more delicate article, and would probably imply a special preparation beyond that of the ordinary use.

*nor yet staves.*] The original text varies between the singular and the plural. The latter may be a correction, from Luke ix. 3, intended to avoid the apparent discrepancy with Mark vi. 8; but there is no real difficulty in the verbal variation, as the meaning of the command is simply that they are to make no special preparation for a journey, but to travel in their ordinary condition. Even the staff was not to be provided or taken as a special addition, though it was not forbidden as part of the ordinary equipment. (The oldest MSS have *staff*. F. C. C.)

**12, 13.** *And when . . . . return to you.*] These words, as well as verse 16, are omitted in the parallel places, but are given in substance by St. Luke in the account of the mission of the Seventy, but with some difference of language. They are such as might naturally be repeated on both occasions.

**14.** *shake off the dust.*] Probably as implying that the city was to be treated as a heathen place, the dust of which was regarded by the Jews as defiling. (See Lightfoot.)

**15.** *Verily I say unto you . . . . that city.*] This verse is given in substance by St. Luke, not in this narrative, but in that of the mission of the Seventy. It is however given with the present context by St. Mark, who thus confirms St. Matthew's statement that the same or similar words were used on this occasion.

### 17–42. General Instructions to the Apostles.

Here commences an entirely new portion of the discourse, containing, not instructions for the Apostles in their present mission, but predictions and precepts concerning later events, relating, primarily, to the ministry of the Apostles after their Lord's ascension; and, secondarily to the general position and duties of His disciples in all ages. This portion is, as far as the context is concerned, altogether peculiar to St. Matthew, though much of it is given by the other Evangelists in a different connection, chiefly in Mark xiii. and Luke xii. and xxi. On the custom of scourging in the synagogues cf. Acts xxii. 19. It has been well observed by Ebrard that there is nothing corresponding to these permanent directions in St. Luke's account of the mission of the Seventy, which contains only directions for a single task. From this he infers that while the office of the Apostles was a permanent one, that of the Seventy was merely for a specific duty and ceased as soon as that duty was accomplished. The few points of similarity between the two, taken in conjunction with this important difference, are evidence in favour of the historical character of both.

**17-20.** *But beware . . . . in you.*] That these words were in substance spoken at least on two occasions, may be gathered from the single testimony of St. Luke, who records them in xii. 11, 12, and again in xxi. 12-15. From the latter passage, compared with Mark xiii. 9-11, it is clear that the second occasion took place in Jerusalem during the Holy Week, when our Lord predicted the destruction of the temple. The former occasion may perhaps be identified with the present.

**17.** *councils.*] Probably the local courts of judgment established in each city. (See on ch. v. 21.) These courts appear to have held their sittings in the synagogues, and the punishment of scourging, when pronounced, was inflicted on the spot. (Cf. Luke xxi. 12; Acts xxvi. 11.)

18 And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles.

[q Mark 13. 11. Luke 12. 11.] 19 [q] But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak.

20 For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.

[r Luke 21. 16.] 21 [r] And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against *their* parents, and cause them to be put to death.

22 And ye shall be hated of all *men* for my name's sake: [s] but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. [s Mark 13. 13.]

23 But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not [1] have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come. [1 Or, *end*, or, *finish*.]

24 [t] The disciple is not above *his* master, nor the servant above his lord. [t Luke 6. 40. John 13. 16.]

25 It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more *shall they call* them of his household?

---

**18.** *for a testimony against them, &c.*] Rather, "for a testimony to them," &c. The sufferings of the Apostles were to be a testimony, exhibited to their enemies, of the truth of the Gospel which they preached.

**21, 22.** *and the brother . . . . be saved.*] These and the four preceding verses are closely parallel to Mark xiii. 9-13 (where see note), and more remotely to the corresponding place, Luke xxi. 12-17. The parallel, however, in the two discourses does not go beyond these verses. It is not improbable that our Lord, having warned the Apostles on their first mission of the sufferings which awaited them after His departure, should take a second opportunity of repeating the warning as the time of that departure drew nigh. The verses are also repeated in substance in St. Matthew's report of the latter discourse (ch. xxiv. 9-13), which shews clearly that this Evangelist was aware of the repetition.

**23.** *till the Son of man be come.*] The *coming of the Son of man* is an expression taken from Dan. vii. 13, and must be interpreted as denoting the fulfilment of that prophecy. But Daniel's prophecy relates, in the first instance, to a kingdom to be established on earth in succession to the four kingdoms previously spoken of, though with a further reference to the continuance of that kingdom after the end of the world. Hence the coming of Christ may be understood in two senses: either, (1) Of His presence with and reign over the Church militant on earth (cf. Matt. xxviii. 20; John xiv. 18, xxi. 22), or, (2) Of His presence with and reign over the Church triumphant in heaven (cf. Rev. i. 7, xxii. 3, 7, 12). The establishment of the first kingdom may be regarded as, in one sense, commencing with the destruction of Jerusalem, as the second commences with the Day of Judgment. (See below on ch. xvi. 28, xxiv. 34.) The destruction of Jerusalem, though a conspicuous feature of the first coming, must not be identified with it. (See on ch. xxiv. 29, 30.) Hence the present verse in the original sense, as addressed to the Apostles, may be understood as meaning that their missionary work in Judea should not be completed before the destruction of Jerusalem and the establishment of Christ's first kingdom on earth. In a secondary sense it may also mean that the missionary work of the Church in general shall not be completed till His second coming to judge the world.

**25.** *If they have called, &c.*] This accusation is implied in the language of the Pharisees (ch. ix. 34), and is more expressly stated (ch. xii. 24). This latter chapter is probably, in the order of time, prior to the present discourse. (See on ch. viii. 14.)

*Beelzebub.*] In the original *Beelzebul*, which is probably the true reading in all the places of the New Testament where this name occurs. Two principal explanations have been given of the word as thus written: (1) According to the Hebrew of the Old Testament, the signification is, *Lord of the dwelling*, a term perhaps corresponding to that of, *Prince of the power of the air* (Ephes. ii. 2). To this meaning there may possibly be an allusion in the choice of the expression, *the master of the house;* our Lord thus appropriating to Himself, in another sense, as a term of honour, the name which his enemies had given in blasphemy. (2) In later Hebrew, the word Beelzebul means *Lord of dung;* and is possibly a contemptuous perversion of the name Baal-

26 Fear them not therefore: [u]for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known.

[u] Mark 4. 22. Luke 8. 17. & 12. 2.

27 What I tell you in darkness, *that* speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, *that* preach ye upon the housetops.

28 [x]And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.

[x] Luke 12. 4.

29 Are not two sparrows sold for a [1]farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father.

[1] *It is in value half-penny farthing in the original, as being the tenth part of the Roman penny.*

30 [y]But the very hairs of your head are all numbered.

[y] 2 Sam. 14. 11. Acts 27. 34.

31 Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows.

32 [z]Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven.

[z] Luke 12. 8.

33 [a]But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.

[a] Mark 8. 38. Luke 9. 26. 2 Tim. 2. 12.

34 [b]Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.

[b] Luke 12. 51.

35 For I am come to set a man at variance [c]against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law.

[c] Mic. 7. 6.

36 And a man's foes *shall be* they of his own household.

37 [d]He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.

[d] Luke 14. 26.

---

zebub, *Lord of flies*, the god of the Ekronites (2 Kings i. 2). Or, as Lightfoot (on ch. xii. 24) explains, an ignominious name, signifying, *Lord of Idolatry*. It is possible, however, that the change may be merely euphonic.

**26.** *for there is nothing covered, &c.*] The form of this sentence seems to indicate a proverbial saying, which our Lord uses here with special reference to His Gospel, which, though now obscure, shall shortly be made manifest and be triumphant. This saying is given with a different context, but in the same sense (Luke viii. 17), and repeated by the same Evangelist (xii. 2). The latter passage may perhaps, like other parts of the same chapter, be identified with the present discourse, and corresponds with it not only in the present verse, but in the following, down to verse 33.

**28.** *him which is able to destroy, &c.*] Namely, God. (Compare James iv. 12.) The interpretation of some modern commentators who suppose the devil to be intended is both unsuited to the context and inconsistent with the way in which Satan is generally spoken of in Scripture. The contrast is between evil men doing the work of Satan, who are not to be feared, and God the true object of fear. The interpretation of the passage may be determined by a single question: Has Satan power to cast into hell *those who disobey him?* This is the power to which the context clearly points.

**30.** *But the very hairs, &c.*] In the original, the position of the pronoun is emphatic, "but of you the very hairs," &c. Men, who are held of such account in God's sight that even their hairs are numbered, are contrasted with the sparrows which are of such small value; and yet even these cannot fall without God's permission.

**34, 35.** *Think not . . . mother in law.*] These verses also occur in substance in Luke xii., but in a different part of the chapter from the previous parallels. Their position there confirms the opinion that St. Matthew has recorded a continuous discourse, and that the 12th chapter of St. Luke, which is ostensibly a collection of various discourses without note of the time or place of their delivery, has interwoven in its contents some portions of this charge to the Apostles. (See, however, notes on St. Luke. F. C. C.)

**35.** *For I am come, &c.*] The language of Micah (vii. 6), descriptive of the state of Judah in his day, and the evils which ultimately led to the first destruction of Jerusalem, is here used by our Lord as typical of the state of things consequent on His own coming and rejection, which led to the second destruction. The hatred of the unbelieving Jews towards Christ would extend to those of their own households who became followers of Christ, and thus the immediate effect of His coming would be not peace but discord.

e ch. 16. 24. Mark 8. 34. Luke 9. 23.

38 [e]And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.

f John 12. 25.

39 [f]He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.

g Luke 10. 16. John 13. 20.

40 ¶ [g]He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.

41 He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward.

h Mark 9. 41.

42 [h]And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold *water* only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.

## CHAPTER XI.

*2 John sendeth his disciples to Christ. 7 Christ's testimony concerning John. 18 The opinion of the people, both concerning John and Christ. 20 Christ upbraideth the unthankfulness and unrepentance of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum: 25 and praising his Father's wisdom in revealing the gospel to the simple, 28 he calleth to him all such as feel the burden of their sins.*

AND it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding his twelve disciples, he departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities.

c Luke 7. 18.

2 [c]Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples,

3 And said unto him, Art thou he

---

**38.** *taketh not his cross, and followeth after me.*] *His* cross, *i.e.* his sufferings, whatever he may be called upon to suffer in my name, even as I must actually bear the cross and suffer upon it. A prophetic allusion to the mode of His own death—a mode by no means probable or likely to be foreseen by merely human wisdom, as crucifixion was not a Jewish punishment. Similar prophetic allusions occur in other places, as ch. xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34, x. 21; and more directly John iii. 14, xii. 32.

**39.** *He that findeth, &c.*] Rather, he that hath *found*. Life is spoken of in two senses: the life of this world, and life eternal. He who so cares for the things of this world as not to take up his cross and follow Christ shall lose that life eternal which can be obtained only through Christ.

**41.** *in the name of a prophet.*] *I.e.* in the character of a prophet, because he is a prophet, and from no other motive.

**42.** *one of these little ones.*] The expression, "in the name of a disciple," *i.e.* because he is a disciple, shews that the *little ones* must be understood as meaning *disciples*. (Cf. Zech. xiii. 7.) "To one of the least of my disciples, because he is a disciple." For the expression, "in the name of a disciple," compare Mark ix. 41, where the Evangelist uses the equivalent expression, "because ye belong to Christ." The two passages, however, can hardly be regarded as different reports of the same discourse. The narrative of St. Matthew in the part parallel to Mark ix. is so strictly consecutive that we can hardly suppose that one isolated verse was transferred from that into the present context. Probably it was in substance repeated a second time.

CHAP. XI.—1–20. THE MESSAGE OF JOHN.

**1.** *he departed thence.*] St. Matthew here differs from St. Mark and St. Luke. They narrate the execution by the Apostles of their mission. St. Matthew mentions in this verse our Lord's own course during the absence of the Apostles: His preaching in the cities of the Jews, or perhaps of the people of this district (the relative *their* has no immediate antecedent, cf. ch. xii. 9), though in a different circuit from those taken by the Apostles.

**2.** *Now when John had heard, &c.*] This incident seems to be placed by St. Matthew somewhat later than its chronological order. The imprisonment of John took place before our Lord's second journey to Galilee (see on ch. iv. 12), and his death took place probably about the time of the mission of the Twelve (see Mark vi. 13, 14). The message of the Baptist must, therefore, be placed some time before the mission, probably at the time assigned by St. Luke. (See note on ch. viii. 14; and on Mark vi. 13.)

*the works of Christ.*] *I.e.* the works foretold of the Messiah, and now done by Jesus. It is on account of this feature in the work that our Lord's reply is an answer to John's question. It is not merely as mighty works but as works foretold by the prophets, that they prove the Doer to be He that should come.

*he sent, &c.*] The tenor of the narrative seems to imply that the question was asked by John for himself and not merely to convince his disciples, as the answer of our Lord

that should come, or do we look for another?

4 Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see:

5 [d] The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and [e] the poor have the gospel preached to them.

[d] Isai. 35. 6.

[e] Isai. 61. 1.

6 And blessed is *he*, whosoever shall not be offended in me.

7 ¶ And as they departed, Jesus began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken with the wind?

8 But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft *clothing* are in kings' houses.

9 But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet.

10 For this is *he*, of whom it is written, [f] Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

[f] Mal. 3. 1.

11 Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.

---

is addressed to John. It does not, however, follow that the Baptist's own faith in the Messiahship of Jesus had failed, which would be hardly consistent with our Lord's words concerning him in verse 7, and with his own testimony to our Lord. There is some probability in the interpretation which supposes John's question to be dictated, not by doubt but by impatience; that it is, in fact, an indirect appeal to Jesus to declare Himself and hasten His kingdom: but it is also possible that the question may indicate a real doubt on the part of John, though not of the kind usually supposed. John had heard in prison that "a great prophet had risen up" (Luke vii. 16), he had heard of "the works of the Christ," but we are not positively told that he knew that Jesus Himself, or some other in His name, was the doer of these works; or it is possible that, though convinced in his own mind, he may yet have wished to suggest to our Lord a more direct declaration of Himself as the Messiah. Such a doubt may possibly have existed and is perhaps indirectly met by our Lord's reply. The works themselves sufficiently declare that none but the Messiah is the doer of them.

*two of his disciples.*] Four of the oldest MSS and late editors have *by his disciples*; but the A. V. is supported by good MSS and versions. F. C. C.

5. *The blind receive their sight, &c.*] An application of Messianic prophecies, chiefly from Isai. xxix. 18, 19; xxxv. 5; and lxi. 1. The raising of the dead is not mentioned in these prophecies, but this addition has a special significance if we follow the order of St. Luke's narrative, in which the message of the Baptist immediately follows the raising of the widow's son at Nain. The language of our Lord's reply is almost word for word the same in the two Evangelists.

7. *A reed shaken, &c.*] *I. e.* a wavering and unstable man—one like the reeds of the Jordan, where John preached. The language of the following verses seems to show that this expression is not to be understood, as some interpret, in a literal sense ("ye did not go merely to see the reeds on the river's bank"—an interpretation which makes the words *shaken by the wind* superfluous), but is meant figuratively of John, and is intended to clear him from the charge of wavering in his faith.

10. *which shall prepare thy way.*] It is remarkable that both St. Matthew and St. Luke, as well as St. Mark in another place (i. 2), cite this prophecy of Malachi with the substitution of "*thy* way before *thee*." In the original, God is represented as speaking of Himself: in the citation He addresses the Messiah. The Lord thus, in applying the prophecy to Himself as Messiah, asserts His own Deity, as one with the Lord of hosts who speaks through the prophet. The fact that this verse is quoted by all the three Evangelists in the same form, a form which does not correspond either with the LXX or with the Hebrew, cannot be explained on the theory of quoting from memory. There is clearly some principle of quotation. (Compare Lee's 'Lectures on Inspiration,' p. 358 Ed. 2.)

11. *he that is least in the kingdom of heaven.*] He that holds the smallest place in the Christian Church (cf. ch. iii. 3) is greater as regards his office than he who prepared the way for its founding. This is said not of the personal merits but of the official position

g Luke 16. 16.

1 Or, *is gotten by force, and they that thrust men.*

h Mal. 4. 5.

i Luke 7. 31.

12 [g] And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven [1] suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.

13 For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.

14 And if ye will receive *it*, this is [h] Elias, which was for to come.

15 He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

16 ¶ [i] But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows,

17 And saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented.

18 For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil.

19 The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children.

k Luke 10. 13.

20 ¶ [k] Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not:

21 Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the

---

of the two. (The clause may be rendered "he that is less *than he*," &c. F. C. C.)

12. *from the days of John, &c.*] The ministry of the Baptist might now be referred to as a thing of the past, being terminated by his imprisonment.

*suffereth violence, &c.*] Is eagerly seized by persons pressing into it; cf. Luke xvi. 16, where the same thought is repeated on another occasion. This carries on the thought of the last verse. John was the last of those who predicted a future kingdom. After him the kingdom became present through the coming of Christ, and now men are eagerly pressing into it.

15. *He that hath ears, &c.*] These words lay stress on the importance of our Lord's interpretation of Malachi's prophecy, as showing His own Messiahship, and by implication His Divinity. John is the true Elijah of the prophecy, not literally (see John i. 21) but in spirit. Elijah was to come before the great and terrible day of the Lord. But if so, the LORD who is to come after John is none other than Jesus Christ.

16. *But whereunto shall I liken, &c.*] The natural interpretation of this passage certainly represents *this generation* (not John and our Lord) as the children who complain that their piping and their mourning are not responded to. The order too, John coming first, confirms this interpretation. The meaning then may be given as follows: Those who pipe are the Jews condemning the asceticism of John, and complaining that he will not respond to their demand of a more lax mode of life. Those who mourn are the same Jews complaining of our Lord as not exhibiting the severity of life befitting a prophet. But in both cases alike *wisdom is justified of her children;* the foolish children are discontented with both: the children of wisdom acknowledge the divine wisdom manifest in both, their different modes of life befitting their different missions. The simile is taken from children imitating in games a marriage or a funeral, with the accompaniments of merry or mournful music.

19. *But wisdom is justified, &c.*] The natural interpretation of these words seems to be "the children of wisdom, those who are really wise, will rightly estimate the divine wisdom, even when manifested in different ways for different purposes." The interpretation which renders ἐδικαιώθη *is condemned*, seems untenable, both because the word does not bear this sense in any other passage of the New Testament, and because the same word is expressly used by St. Matthew in the next chapter (xii. 37) in direct opposition to that sense. (Instead of *children*, some late editions have *works;* so Tisch., Treg., Weiss, and Westcott and Hort, on the authority of ℵ and B*. The A. V. has ample support of MSS, Versions, and Fathers. F. C. C.)

21-23. *Woe unto thee .... to hell.*] These words are recorded by St. Luke as forming part of the address to the Seventy, whose mission is not mentioned by the other Evangelists. It is possible that the words may have been used twice, as is supposed by Meyer, Alford, and others; but the recurrence also of verses 25-27 (cf. Luke x. 21, 22) renders it more probable that the two reports refer to the same occasion. The language of St. Matthew at verse 20 does not necessarily mark a continuous discourse with the preceding verses (see below on verse 25); and it is possible that this Evangelist, who omits the mission of the Seventy, may have recorded here a portion of the discourses connected with that event on account of their similarity

mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes.

22 But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you.

23 And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day.

24 But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.

25 ¶ [l] At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.

26 Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight.

27 [m] All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; [n] neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and *he* to whomsoever the Son will reveal *him*.

[l] Luke 10. 21.
[m] John 3. 35.
[n] John 6. 46.

---

of subject. We have seen on former occasions that St. Matthew's grouping is generally determined by similarity of events, not by chronological succession. (Cf. Krafft, 'Chronol. u. Harm.' p. 110.)

**21.** *Chorazin .... Bethsaida!*] The site of Chorazin seems to have been identified by the recent researches, in connection with the Palestine Exploration Fund, with the modern Kerazeh at the N.W. end of the lake, two miles north of Tell Hum (Capernaum). On that of Bethsaida see below on ch. xiv. 22. No miracle of our Lord is recorded as having been done at Chorazin. The feeding of the 5000 took place in a desert place belonging to Bethsaida, but there is some geographical difficulty as regards the identification of the place. Both cities, however, were in the immediate neighbourhood of Capernaum, our Lord's principal residence, and therefore within the region of his chief miracles, and were doubtless the scene of some of those many unrecorded miracles spoken of, John xx. 30. This favoured city itself, exalted to heaven by Christ's presence in it, is still more severely condemned; the comparison with Sodom implying a deeper reprobation than that with Tyre and Sidon.

**23.** *to hell.*] In the original, *to Hades*. The word does not imply the place of eternal punishment, but the abode of the dead (see on ch. xvi. 18). In the present place, however, it is merely used as the antithesis of heaven, the lowest as contrasted with the highest position, as the Hebrew equivalent word is employed, Ps. cxxxix. 8; Amos ix. 2. (The two clauses are rendered on the authority of the oldest and best MSS, C D, in addition to ℵ B, *shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? Thou shalt be brought down, or come down, to Hades*. The reading of the A. V. is supported by Luke x. 15, and is defended by Weiss. F. C. C.)

**25.** *At that time.*] These words seem to intimate a break in the discourse; and to show that the words which follow, though spoken about the same time, were not immediately connected with the preceding. We may perhaps fairly paraphrase with Hammond "about that time," upon some occasion taken. The occasion, if we follow St. Luke, was the return of the Seventy, and if so, the words *at that time* may perhaps be interpreted widely, signifying within a limited period, embracing the mission of the Seventy; the former words (verses 20-24) being spoken on their departure, and the subsequent ones on their return.

*these things.*] If we suppose the chronological connection of these words to be that given by St. Luke, the expression "these things" will naturally refer to that knowledge of Christ's kingdom which had been revealed to the Twelve and to the Seventy for the purpose of their mission. The sense, indeed, will be the same if we connect the words with their present context. The Messiahship of Jesus as testified by His mighty works, though unacknowledged by the cities which had witnessed them, had through Divine Revelation been made known to and acknowledged by the disciples.

**27.** *neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, &c.*] The parallels between this and the language of St. John and of our Lord as recorded by St. John (see reff.), are surely sufficient to show that there is no substantial difference between the different Evangelists in their views of our Lord's person and nature; and that the Gospel of St.

28 ¶ Come unto me, all *ye* that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

29 Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: [o]and ye shall find rest unto your souls.

30 [p]For my yoke *is* easy, and my burden is light.

o Jer. 6. 16.

p 1 John 5. 3.

## CHAPTER XII.

1 *Christ reproveth the blindness of the Pharisees concerning the breach of the sabbath,* 3 *by scriptures,* 9 *by reason,* 13 *and by a miracle.* 22 *He healeth the man possessed that was blind and dumb.* 31 *Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven.* 36 *Account shall be made of idle words.* 38 *He rebuketh the unfaithful, who seek after a sign:* 49 *and sheweth who is his brother, sister, and mother.*

AT that time [q]Jesus went on the sabbath day through the corn; and his disciples were an hungred, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat.

2 But when the Pharisees saw *it*, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the sabbath day.

3 But he said unto them, Have ye not read [r]what David did, when he was an hungred, and they that were with him;

4 How he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, [s]but only for the priests?

q Deut. 23. 25. Mark 2. 23. Luke 6. 1.

r 1 Sam. 21. 6.

s Ex. 29. 32. 33. Lev. 8. 31. & 24. 9.

---

John, far from being the representative of a later theology, does but more fully expound what is implicitly contained in the earliest of the gospels.

**28.** *Come unto me, &c.*] These words derive their significance from the preceding assertion of our Lord's unity with the Father. It is only as God that He is able to give rest to the souls of those who are weary with the burden of sin and of the law.

### CHAP. XII.—1–13. ON BREACHES OF THE SABBATH.

**1.** *At that time.*] The two events which follow are connected by both taking place on the Sabbath day (though not on the same day, see Luke vi. 6), and by the lesson drawn from each concerning the observance of that day. Both, however, seem to belong to an earlier period, as they are placed by St. Mark and St. Luke before the choice of the Twelve. That this latter arrangement should be preferred may be argued as follows: The walk through the cornfields must have taken place soon after the Passover (see next note). But the feeding of the five thousand mentioned in ch. xiv. took place just *before* a Passover (John vi. 4). There must, therefore, have been nearly a year between the two, which supports the earlier arrangement of the present narrative. The repeated occurrence in St. Matthew of the expression *at that time* with regard to events narrated out of chronological order, seems to show that the Evangelist did not intend to denote by it any exact determination of time or continuity in the order of events. (See above on ch. xi. 25.)

*to pluck the ears of corn.*] St. Luke adds, "and did eat, rubbing them in their hands," which implies that the ears must have been nearly ripe. The earliest harvest cannot be placed earlier than the beginning of May (see Robinson, 'Researches,' vol. ii. p. 99, ed. 1841; Thomson, 'Land and Book,' p. 647, ed. 1864). The sheaf of first fruits offered at the Passover (Levit. xxiii. 10) was a *green* sheaf (see Philo, 'De Septen.' 19, quoted by Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' No. 1254). We may, therefore, fix the present narrative to some time between the Passover and Pentecost, and thus far at least limit the various interpretations of the "second-first Sabbath" (Luke vi. 1).

**2.** *that which is not lawful.*] To pluck the ears with the hand was expressly permitted by the Law (Deut. xxiii. 25), though Levit. xxiii. 14 may perhaps be understood as forbidding it till after the presentation of the sheaf of the first fruits. If this interpretation be accepted it confirms the supposition that the event here recorded took place after the Passover. The objection of the Pharisees, however, turned only on the supposed unlawfulness of plucking and eating on the Sabbath, which seems to have been regarded as unlawful by some at least of the later Rabbis (see Lightfoot on this place), and this view might possibly have been supported by the analogy of the manna-gathering (Exod. xvi. 22).

**4.** *the shewbread.*] From 1 Sam. xxi. 6 it appears that the shewbread was given to David on the day on which it was changed, namely, on the Sabbath (see Levit. xxiv. 8). The example is thus appropriate as regards the day as well as the act.

Num. 28. 5 Or have ye not read in the [f] law, how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless?

6 But I say unto you, That in this place is *one* greater than the temple.

7 But if ye had known what *this* meaneth, [a] I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.

Hos. 6. ch. 9. 13.

8 For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day.

Mark 3. Luke 6. 6.

9 And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagogue:

10 ¶ And, behold, there was a man which had *his* hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath days? that they might accuse him.

11 And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift *it* out?

12 How much then is a man better

---

5. *profane the sabbath.*] *I.e.* do acts which according to your judgment would be regarded as profanation, such as the Sabbatical sacrifices (Numb. xxviii. 9), and even the removal of the shewbread alluded to in the previous verse. This second reference to Scripture is recorded by St. Matthew only.

6. *one greater than the temple.*] Hence that which is permitted and even commanded in the case of the servants of the temple may much more be permitted to the servants of Him who is greater than the temple. (Meyer.) (The reading, "**a thing greater**," is supported by all the best MSS and late Editors, including Weiss. The *greater thing* is the principle established in the words which follow. F. C. C.)

7. *I will have mercy, &c.*] See on ch. ix. 13. This reference in both places is peculiar to St. Matthew. Here it may have a double reference to the case of David, and to the parallel case of the disciples. The precept of the law (Levit. xxiv. 9), which gave the shewbread to the priests, ought not to be interpreted so literally as to forbid the priest from relieving the hunger of David, neither ought the law of the Sabbath to be so interpreted as to forbid the satisfying the hunger of the disciples.

8. *For the Son of man, &c.*] In St. Mark's narrative this sentence is preceded by the words, "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," then follows the inference, "Therefore the Son of Man," &c. And no doubt this is the complete statement which is given by St. Matthew in an abridged form. But the interpretation which some have attempted to put on these words "the Sabbath was made for man's benefit, therefore any man (*quivis homo*—Grot.) is lord of the Sabbath" is surely untenable. On what principle of legislation can it be maintained that, because laws are imposed by the ruler for the benefit of the subject, therefore they may be dispensed with by the subject at his own convenience? This is utterly untenable as regards the laws of man, still more as regards the laws of God. The reasoning is rather as follows: there are laws of eternal obligation for which man was made, and whose authority can never be set aside. There are others of temporary obligation, made for man, designed for his discipline, till Christ should come and the shadow give place to the substance. Christ as the Son of Man, the Messiah, the author and end of the law, is its Lord, not indeed to destroy, but to make perfect—to change its observance from the letter to the spirit. Compare Trench on the Miracles, p. 318. (Omit *even* before "of the Sabbath day." So *all* the best MSS and Versions. F. C. C.)

9. *And when he was departed thence, &c.*] On another Sabbath, as we learn from St. Luke, probably on the next following. The two narratives are consecutive in all the synoptists, which seems to indicate a connection in time as well as in subject.

10. *And they asked him, &c.*] In St. Mark and St. Luke the question is asked by our Lord of the Pharisees, but in a different form. "Is it lawful to *do good*," &c. In the latter form it is clear that it could not have been asked by the Pharisees. But, as Abp. Trench has observed, the form of the question in St. Luke, "I will ask you one thing," seems to imply an answer to a previous question, and thus the two accounts supplement each other. It will be observed that verses 11, 12 are omitted by the other Evangelists, and perhaps the simplest mode of explaining the variation is to suppose that St. Matthew in these verses records fully our Lord's words, while St. Mark and St. Luke record more briefly only the interrogation which introduced them.

11. *And he said, &c.*] These words are omitted by St. Mark and St. Luke in this narrative, but are recorded by the latter (xiv.

than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days.

13 Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched *it* forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other.

14 ¶ Then the Pharisees went out, and [1]held a council against him, how they might destroy him.

[1] Or, *took counsel.*

15 But when Jesus knew *it*, he withdrew himself from thence: and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all;

16 And charged them that they should not make him known:

17 That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying,

18 [a]Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles.

[a] Isai. 42. 1.

19 He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets.

20 A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory.

21 And in his name shall the Gentiles trust.

22 ¶ [b]Then was brought unto him

[b] Luke 11. 14.

---

5) with a different context. The cavils against our Lord's healing on the Sabbath were so frequent, and the answer so appropriate, that it is likely to have been used more than once.

14–21. Our Lord's Patience.

17. *That it might be fulfilled, &c.*] The form of this citation is remarkable. Verse 21 is taken from the LXX, and differs from the original, "and the isles shall wait for his law." Yet the earlier part of the prophecy differs considerably from the LXX, especially in the opening words, "Behold my servant," which follow the Hebrew, rejecting the LXX gloss, "Jacob my servant;" "Israel my chosen" (a gloss to which the translators were probably led by ch. xli. 8). This may be regarded as intimating that though there are portions of Isaiah's prophecy in which "the Lord's servant" designates the people of Israel, yet there are portions, these verses included, which can only be understood of the person of the Messiah. The work of Christ is partly peculiar to Himself, partly shared by His Church, by the Jewish Church before His advent, and by the Christian Church since. This work is spoken of in general through the later chapters of Isaiah, and accordingly we find portions applicable only to the person of the Messiah, mingled with other portions applicable to His Church on earth, as sharing imperfectly in the Redeemer's office. For some valuable remarks on this import of the prophecy, see Dr. Payne Smith on the Messianic interpretation of Isaiah, pp. 140-150. (See also note on Isai. xli. 8; vol. v. p. 233. F. C. C.)

20. *A bruised reed, &c.*] Clearly meant figuratively of those who are bowed down by suffering and sin. And so our Lord speaks of himself. (See above, ch. xi. 28.)

*till he send forth judgment unto victory.*] *I. e.* till he shall have carried out his judgment to its final triumph. The sense of the passage is the same, indicating the full establishment of Christ's jurisdiction, though the translation is not literal.

21. *And in his name, &c.*] From the LXX; see on verse 1. In the original this is implied by the context, though not actually stated, the "islands" (*i.e.* the remote coasts beyond the sea; cf. Jer. xxv. 22) meaning the furthest nations of the Gentiles, who shall submit to His law through trust in the just and merciful character of His rule, as described in the preceding verses.

22–37. The Charge of Satanic Agency.

22. *Then was brought, &c.*] The order of the narrative seems to shew that this miracle is the parallel to Mark iii. 22, &c., where the same circumstances are narrated. St. Mark, however, interposes the call of the Twelve between this narrative and that which in St. Matthew immediately precedes it; and it is probable that this, together with the Sermon on the Mount and the events immediately following, belong to the period of retirement mentioned in verse 15, before our Lord again comes in contact with the Pharisees, as in verse 24. (See note on ch. viii. 14.) St. Matthew, agreeably to his custom of grouping events according to similarity of features, not to chronological order, unites the narrative with those of verses 1 and 10, all being occasions on which our Lord's conduct aroused the hostility of the Pharisees. In St. Luke xi. 14 the present narrative occurs,

one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he healed him, insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw.

23 And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David?

[c ch. 9. 34.] 24 [c] But when the Pharisees heard *it*, they said, This *fellow* doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils.

25 And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand:

26 And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?

27 And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast *them* out? therefore they shall be your judges.

28 But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.

29 Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house.

30 He that is not with me is

---

with a different context, among a collection of sayings of our Lord, which appear to have been put together as a supplement to the consecutive narrative without any mark of time.

*blind and dumb.*] On the nature of this possession, see above on ch. iv. 24.

**24.** *But when the Pharisees heard, &c.*] This accusation naturally results from the council held by the Pharisees, as mentioned in verse 14. This is the first occasion on which they have an opportunity of prosecuting their design; and therefore it is mentioned by the Evangelist in connection with the design itself, though some events had in point of time intervened between the two.

**26.** *if Satan cast out Satan.*] Our Lord thus expressly asserts the existence of a personal Tempter and a real kingdom of evil. Nor can this be evaded by supposing, as some have done, that He merely accommodated His language to the popular belief, for He used the same language in private with His disciples. (See ch. xiii. 39, xxv. 41; Mark iv. 15; Luke xxii. 31.)

**27.** *by whom do your children cast them out?*] It seems natural to interpret these words as implying that some professed cures of the kind had been wrought by the disciples of the Pharisees. The interpretation which supposes *your children* to mean the Apostles seems very strained. But it may be questioned whether these cures were real or pretended. Those mentioned by Josephus ('Ant.' viii. 2, § 5, 'B. J.' vii. 6, § 3) are palpable impostures. Others, mentioned by early Christian writers (*e.g.* Justin, 'Dial. cum Tryph.' c. 5; Irenæus ii. 5, cited by Grotius on this place), have been adduced as evidence that devils were really cast out by Jewish exorcists in the name of God. And we know too little of this mysterious affliction to warrant us in saying that this is impossible. Yet our Lord's own words seem to suggest a different interpretation. By appealing to His casting out of devils by the Spirit of God, as a proof that the kingdom of God was come, He seems clearly to distinguish His own miracles from others not wrought by the same Spirit, nor conveying the same evidence. The argument, therefore, may perhaps be represented as a rebuke of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, who permitted their own disciples to pretend to miraculous power by means of superstitious spells and incantations (see Josephus, *l. c.*), but when He came preaching the kingdom of God and working true miracles, would not listen to His teaching or believe His works, but preferred to say, "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub."

*they shall be your judges.*] By showing their malevolence in attributing His miracles to Satan, which they did not do in the case of similar miracles, or even pretended miracles, wrought by others.

**28.** *then the kingdom of God is come unto you.*] For the *kingdom of God*, see on ch. iii. 2. The miracles were at least an evidence of the truth of His mission, and therefore a proof that the kingdom of the Messiah which He preached (see ch. iv. 17) was really come. For the argument, see above on verse 27.

**29.** *how can one enter, &c.*] An illustration possibly taken from Isai. xlix. 24. The strong man is Satan; he that binds him is Christ. Christ could not spoil the house of Satan—expel his evil spirits—had He not first overcome Satan himself.

**30.** *He that is not with me.*] There is no middle course between Christ and Satan.

against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.

31 ¶ Wherefore I say unto you, [d] All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy *against* the *Holy* Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men.

[d] Mark 3. 28. Luke 12. 10. 1 John 5. 16.

32 And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the *world* to come.

33 Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by *his* fruit.

34 O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? [e] for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

[e] Luke 6. 45.

35 A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things.

---

They who will not join with Christ in His warfare against Satan, must directly or indirectly aid Satan against Christ. This seems the natural meaning of the words, used probably with reference to men who, like the Pharisees, were bound by their position as religious teachers to be with Christ in His warfare against evil, and who first stood aloof and then actively opposed Him. There does not seem to be any special reference to the Jewish exorcists as working rival miracles. The context, however, seems to imply that the words relate to those who have had the opportunity of knowing Christ, and have wilfully rejected Him. It is strange that some critics should have seen an "apparent contradiction" between this verse and Luke ix. 50; there being no middle course, each is the necessary logical equivalent of the other.

31. *the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, &c.*] St. Mark (iii. 30) adds the explanatory words, "Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." This accusation then was clearly the occasion which led our Lord to use these awful words; but the question may still be asked, Were they used in judgment or in warning? Do they mean that the Pharisees actually had committed this unpardonable sin, or that they were in danger of it? This question, as regards the individuals, we are not called upon to answer; we know not the exact state of mind in which they were; but the lesson of the text is equally clear if we take it as a warning occasioned by what was at least a near approach to that awful sin. He who, with full evidence and knowledge of the Divine power manifested by Christ, persists in enmity to Him, and blasphemes the work of the Holy Spirit as the work of Satan, who wilfully and knowingly calls evil good and good evil, gives proof of that reprobate mind which gives no hope of future repentance. (Compare Heb. vi. 4-6.) This interpretation is in substance adopted in the 16th Article of 1552: "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is when a man, of malice and stubbornness of mind, doth rail upon the truth of God's word manifestly perceived." Thus interpreted, the sin is not a single act, but a spirit of hostility to Christ, manifesting itself in continued acts. If this be the case, there is no reason why any repentant sinner should despair of salvation under the fear that he has committed this sin. The fact of his repentance itself shews that his state of mind has not been that of entire enmity; that he has not so grieved the Holy Spirit as to be finally forsaken by Him. On the nature of this sin against the Holy Ghost, some valuable remarks will be found in Müller, on the 'Christian Doctrine of Sin,' vol. ii. p. 475, Eng. Tr., and in Olshausen's Commentary on this passage.

32. *whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man.*] *I.e.* against Jesus the Messiah (see on ch. viii. 20), not, however, recognising Him as such, nor intending to blaspheme the Holy Ghost and power manifested in Him (Acts x. 38). In this sense St. Paul speaks of himself (1 Tim. i. 13). In such persons there is room for better knowledge and repentance.

33. *Either make, &c.*] *I.e.* do not ascribe good works to an evil author. If the work which I have done is good, acknowledge that it is of God. If ye ascribe it to the evil one, shew that the work itself is evil. This is the primary connection of these words; but the general principle which they exemplify is further applied to the Pharisees themselves, whose words betrayed the real state of their hearts. The tree must be like its fruit. My works being good must come from Him who is good. Your hearts, being evil, bring forth evil words.

35. *of the heart.*] These words are not found in any of the oldest MSS. and were

36 But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.

37 For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.

38 ¶ [f] Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee.

[f] ch. 16. 1. Luke 11. 29. 1 Cor. 1. 22.

39 But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas:

40 [g] For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

[g] Jonah 1. 17.

41 The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: [h] because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas *is* here.

[h] Jonah 3. 5.

---

probably inserted as a gloss from the margin at a very early time, since they are recognised by the old Italic Versions. F. C. C.)

**36.** *every idle word, &c.*] Every word which does not do the fitting work of speech, which does not fulfil the purpose for which the gift of speech was given to man. In a similar sense St. Paul (Eph. v. 11) speaks of the *unfruitful* works of darkness, and (Eph. v. 6) of *vain* words; and St. Peter (1st Epistle i. 18) of *vain* conversation. Our words, as well as our deeds, have a good or evil character according as they are or are not in accordance with God's purpose, and for our words as well as for our deeds (the former of course does not exclude the latter) we are responsible in the sight of God. (Compare ch. v. 21, 22.)

38–45. THE DEMAND FOR A SIGN.

**38.** *certain of the scribes, &c.*] Different persons from those mentioned in verse 24. St. Luke puts the two speeches together, and our Lord's two answers following. St. Matthew states the speeches and their respective answers alternately, but the substance of the narrative coincides in each, though referring to different occasions; see note on Luke xi. 10. The occasion is clearly different from that of ch. xvi. 1, which corresponds to Mark viii. 11.

**39.** *adulterous.*] Probably in the sense resembling that frequently used by the prophets of the Old Testament, *idolatrous*. This generation is rejecting Christ as their fathers rejected the Lord and followed strange gods. (See below on verse 43.)

*there shall no sign be given to it.*] The miracle which our Lord had just wrought was indeed itself a sign, and intended as such (cf. John v. 36, x. 25, xv. 24), but it was not such a sign as the Pharisees required. They required as it were a sign to confirm a sign, a token from heaven (not wrought by Him) to assure them that the miraculous power came really from God.

**40.** *three days and three nights.*] *I. e.* three of the periods composed of a night and a day (νυχθήμερον), which was reckoned as one day. On the Jewish principle, that a part of any such period is as the whole (see Lightfoot on this place), a whole day and part of two other days would be reckoned as three (νυχθήμερα). The word is used by St. Paul, 2 Cor. xi. 25. In 1 Sam. xxx. 12, 13, the expressions *three days and three nights*, and *three days agone* are used as synonymous; but the time is not sufficiently specified to allow a positive inference as to the duration intended.

*in the whale's belly.*] Rather, *in the fish's belly*. The Greek word signifies any sea-monster or huge fish, without specifying the kind. So in Jonah i. 17 it is only called *a great fish*. The cavils about the narrowness of the whale's throat rest simply on a mistranslation. Our Lord confirms by His authority the truth of the marvellous history of Jonah, and shews its import as a type of His own death and resurrection.

*in the heart of the earth.*] This expression may allude to our Lord's descent into hell, which is perhaps, but not certainly, also alluded to in similar language by St. Paul, Eph. iv. 9. The conditions of the parallel, however, would be satisfied if we understand the words merely of His burial and resurrection. Instead of this verse, we find in the parallel place of St. Luke, "for as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation." There is no contradiction here between the two Evangelists: both expressions might have been used; indeed the one is but an explanation of the other. It was through his marvellous deliverance that Jonah gave to the Ninevites a sign of his divine mission. His preaching, however effective, was not in itself a sign.

[i] 1 Kings 10. 1.

42 [i] The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon *is* here.

[k] Luke 11. 24.

43 [k] When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none.

44 Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth *it* empty, swept, and garnished.

45 Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: [l] and the last *state* of that man is worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.

[l] Heb. 6. 4. & 10. 26. 2 Pet. 2. 20.

46 ¶ While he yet talked to the people, [m] behold, *his* mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him.

[m] Mark 3. 31. Luke 8. 19.

47 Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee.

48 But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?

49 And he stretched forth his hand

---

**43.** *When the unclean spirit, &c.*] This passage is placed by St. Luke earlier in the narrative as part of our Lord's defence of himself against the accusation that He cast out devils through Beelzebub. There is no doubt an allusion to the miracle which had immediately preceded, and which probably determined St. Luke's arrangement, but the words seem more appropriate with their present context. The "unclean spirit" seems to be spoken of not literally, but figuratively, as appears from the conclusion of verse 45 (omitted by St. Luke). This generation is in a worse state than those which had preceded it, as having rejected greater blessings. The unclean spirit of idolatry had been cast out from the Jewish people from the time of the captivity: they had been swept and garnished and prepared for the reception of another spirit of unbelief by the Scribes and Pharisees. The return of the evil spirit is indicated by their blasphemies against Christ; and their last punishment, their second destruction as a nation, has been more terrible and more lasting than the first. (See Chrysostom 'Homil.' xliii., followed by Alford here.) Thus though there is a direct reference to the blasphemy of the Pharisees, the mention of the "evil and adulterous generation" seems to come properly between.

46–50. OUR LORD'S MOTHER AND BRETHREN.

**46.** *While he yet talked, &c.*] St. Mark agrees with St. Matthew in the place assigned to this circumstance. St. Luke narrates it with a different context, after the parable of the sower, but without any note of time (the *then* of the Authorised Version (Luke viii. 19) is a mistranslation). Both events took place on the same day (see ch. xiii. 1), but the true order is probably that of the two former Evangelists, each of whom illustrates the other. First, "they went into an house" (Mark iii. 19, where see note on the division of the verse); then follow the events narrated Mark iii. 20-35; Matt. xii. 22-50. "The same day Jesus went out of the house" (Matt. xiii. 1). After which follow the parables of the sower, the seed growing secretly, the grain of mustard seed, &c., spoken from a ship on the seashore. On the evening of the same day (Mark iv. 35) Jesus crossed the sea and stilled the tempest.

The circumstance, that the entrance into the house is mentioned only by St. Mark, and the going out of the house only by St. Matthew, is an undesigned coincidence, confirming the accuracy of the narrative. Referring to note on ch. viii. 14, it will be seen that the probable order to be followed throughout in this part of the history is that of St. Mark from iii. 29 to vi. 56.

*his mother and his brethren.*] The probable occasion of their coming is mentioned by St. Mark iii. 21. The manner in which our Lord received the message is thus at once accounted for. From the mention of his mother and his brethren only, it has been conjectured, with some probability, that Joseph was now dead. If we admit, as the most probable hypothesis, that these *brethren* were cousins (see on ch. xiii. 55), two of them, James and Jude, were at this time apostles, and probably among those disciples who were in the house (verse 49). The brethren who stood without will in that case be limited to Joses and perhaps Simon with the sisters. (See Dr. Mill, 'Observations,' &c., p. 228.)

**47.** (This verse is omitted in some MSS, but stands on good authority. F. C. C.)

**48.** *Who is my mother, &c.*] The comment

toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren!

50 For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.

## CHAPTER XIII.

3 *The parable of the sower and the seed:* 18 *the exposition of it.* 24 *The parable of the tares,* 31 *of the mustard seed,* 33 *of the leaven,* 44 *of the hidden treasure,* 45 *of the pearl,* 47 *of the drawnet cast into the sea:* 53 *and how Christ is contemned of his own countrymen.*

THE same day went Jesus out of the house, [a]and sat by the sea side.

[a Mark 4. 1.]

2 And great multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship, and sat; and the whole multitude stood on the shore.

3 And he spake many things unto them in parables, saying, [b]Behold, a sower went forth to sow;

[b Luke 8. 5.]

---

of St. Chrysostom on these words is remarkable. He says (Homil. xliv.) "What she attempted came of overmuch love of honour (φιλοτιμίας ἦν περιττῆς); for she wished to shew to the people that she had power and authority over her Son, imagining not as yet anything great concerning Him: whence also she came unseasonably. Observe then her and their recklessness (ἀπόνοιαν). For when they ought to have gone in and listened with the multitude, or if they were not so minded, to have waited for His bringing His discourse to an end, and then to have come near, they call Him out, and do this before all, exhibiting overmuch love of honour, and wishing to show that with much authority they enjoin him, and this too the Evangelist shews that he is blaming; for with this very allusion he says, *while He yet talked to the people;* as if he should say, What! was there no other opportunity? What! could they not have spoken with Him in private? . . , Whence it is evident that they did this solely out of vain-glory (κενοδοξίᾳ)." The purport of our Lord's words may perhaps be more clearly seen from Mark iii. 21, but the above passage, even if we do not accept the whole of the explanation, is important as shewing that not only the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, but even her actual sinlessness, was not regarded by St. Chrysostom as an article of the Catholic Faith.

CHAP. XIII. 1. *The same day.*] For the arrangement of the following parables in relation to the previous and subsequent events, see note on ch. xii 46.

2–23. THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER.

3. *in parables.*] *Parable* (παραβολή) means etymologically a putting forth of one thing beside another, usually for the purpose of comparison between them. Hence it is applied to a narrative like the parables of Scripture, in which supposed events belonging to the ordinary things of life are employed for the representation and illustration of higher spiritual truths. The distinction between *parable*, *fable*, *mythus*, *proverb* and *allegory* is well explained in a dissertation in Abp. Trench's Notes on the Parables, of which we can only cite the conclusion, "To sum up all, then, the Parable differs from the Fable, moving as it does in a spiritual world, and never transgressing the actual order of things natural—from the Mythus, there being in the latter an unconscious blending of the deeper meaning with the outward symbol, the two remaining separate and separable in the parable—from the Proverb, insomuch as it is longer carried out, and not merely accidentally and occasionally, but necessarily figurative—from the Allegory, comparing as it does one thing *with* another, but, at the same time, preserving them apart as an inner and an outer, and not transferring, as does the allegory, the properties and qualities and relations of one to the other."

*a sower.*] Or, **the sower.** The sower is the first of our Lord's parables recorded by St. Matthew, and probably also the first actually spoken; that of the mustard seed is recorded in the same connection by St. Mark, who also adds one peculiar to himself, that of the seed growing secretly. St. Luke (xiii. 18, 21) gives the parable of the mustard seed and the leaven with a different context; while the remaining four—the tares, the hidden treasure, the pearl of great price, and the draw-net—are peculiar to St. Matthew. From verse 53 it is evident that St. Matthew intends to represent all these seven parables as spoken on the same occasion; the first four, however, from the ship to the people on the shore, the last three in the house to the disciples (see vers. 36). The two recorded by St. Luke in a different connection are appropriate in the place where they occur, and are probably a designed repetition of our Lord's former words, concerning the growth of His kingdom, now so remarkably exemplified in His reception by the people (Luke xiii. 17).

4 And when he sowed, some *seeds* fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them up:

5 Some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth:

6 And when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away.

7 And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and choked them:

8 But other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold.

9 Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

10 And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables?

11 He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.

12 [a] For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.

13 Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.

14 And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, [b] By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive:

15 For this people's heart is waxed gross, and *their* ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed;

[a] ch. 25. 29.

[b] Isai. 6. 9. Mark 4. 12. Luke 8. 10. John 12. 40. Acts 28. 26. Rom. 11. 8.

---

The subject of all these parables is the condition of the Church of Christ (here called the kingdom of heaven; see on ch. iii. 2) upon earth. In the first and second and in the last, that Church is depicted in its outward aspect, as containing apparent as well as real disciples—the evil mingled with the good. The third and fourth represent the growth of the Church from a small beginning to overspread the earth, while the fifth and sixth point out the duty of the individual disciple who would become truly a member of the Church, and appropriate its blessings to himself.

4. *by the way side.*] *I.e.* on the hard footpath of the field where the soil had not been broken up. All these features, the *way side*, the *rocky places*, the *thorns*, may actually be seen in the fields around the lake of Gennesaret, and are described in a striking passage in Stanley's 'Sinai and Palestine,' quoted also by Abp. Trench on this parable.

5. *stony places.*] Rather *rocky places;* a slight coating of mould covering a hard surface of rock where the seed could take root, as it could between loose stones.

10. *And the disciples came.*] St. Mark adds, *when he was alone.* This seems to shew that St. Matthew has anticipated the explanation of the parable, which probably took place after our Lord had gone into the house, verse 36.

13. *because they seeing see not, &c.*] In St. Mark and St. Luke, this is expressed not merely as the reason, but as the purpose of our Lord's teaching in parables, "that, seeing they may see and not perceive," &c. It is in fact both. The blindness of the Jews was a penal blindness denounced by Isaiah against them for their sins; and this blindness reached its height in their inability to receive the teaching of Christ. Our Lord's mode of teaching is adapted to this divine judgment. It was such as in the spiritually minded disciples would indicate a deeper meaning and excite a desire to learn the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, while the carnally minded seeing nothing in it, and desiring no further knowledge, would be left in their blindness. See notes on Mark iv. 11, 12.

14. *the prophecy of Esaias.*] Quoted from the LXX. In the original, the penal character of the infliction is more strongly expressed in the imperative. The words have a primary and immediate reference to the message of the prophet himself; but the same sin and the same penalty were repeated when the prophecy had its crowning fulfilment in the rejection of Christ. The meaning is the same under either mode of expression. "It is not" (says Archbishop Trench) "that by the command 'make the heart of this people fat,' we are to understand that any peculiar hardening thus passed upon them; but that the Lord, having constituted as the righteous law of his moral government, that sin should produce darkness of heart and moral insensibility, declared that He would allow the law

lest at any time they should see with *their* eyes, and hear with *their* ears, and should understand with *their* heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.

16 But blessed *are* your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear.

[c] Luke 10. 24.

17 For verily I say unto you,[c] That many prophets and righteous *men* have desired to see *those things* which ye see, and have not seen *them*; and to hear *those things* which ye hear, and have not heard *them*.

18 ¶ Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower.

19 When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth *it* not, then cometh the wicked *one*, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the way side.

20 But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it;

21 Yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended.

22 He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful.

23 But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth *it*; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.

24 ¶ Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field:

25 But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way.

26 But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also.

---

in their case to take its course; and so also with this latter generation."

**19.** *understandeth it not.*] The reason of their not understanding is clearly set forth in the parable; the heart is hardened, trodden down; the seed cannot penetrate. (Alford.)

*cometh the wicked one.*] In St. Mark, *Satan*, in St. Luke, the *devil*. "The parable itself is here most satisfactory as to the *manner* in which the Evil One proceeds. By *fowls of the air*—passing thoughts and desires which seem insignificant and even innocent—does Satan do his work, and rob the heart of the precious seed." (Alford.) This verse, as well as verse 39, as Olshausen has justly observed, is one "in which our Redeemer speaks of the devil in a *didactic manner*, and that too without having been solicited, and in the narrowest circle of His disciples." The language of St. Mark and St. Luke especially, cannot be interpreted otherwise than of a personal Tempter.

**20.** *he that received the seed.*] Or, *he that was sown.* The seed is the word of God, yet the person receiving it is said to be sown. This, as Dean Alford has observed, is not a confusion of similitudes, but a *deep truth.* The seed sown, springing up in the earth, *becomes the plant*, and bears the fruit or fails of bearing it: it is, therefore, the representative, when sown, of the individual of whom the discourse is. And though in this first case it does not spring up, yet the same form of speech is kept up as in the other cases, where the actual plant is spoken of with reference to its bearing. So, in the explanation of the next parable (verse 38) we are told that the good seed (*i.e.* the seed growing in the field) are the children of the kingdom.

24–52. Other Parables with their Interpretation.

**25.** *while men slept.*] The words are sometimes understood as indicating negligence on the part of the rulers of the Church whereby ungodly men creep into it unawares. But as Archbishop Trench has observed, the expression is infinite; it is not said that the servants who ought to have watched were asleep, but only generally "while men slept," without any intimation that they ought to have done otherwise. The expression, therefore, is probably only equivalent to "at night," and should not be further pressed. (Cf. Job xxxiii. 15.)

27 So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares?

28 He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up?

29 But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them.

30 Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.

31 ¶ Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, [d] The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field:

[d] Mark 4. 30. Luke 13. 19.

32 Which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.

---

*tares.*] The word should rather be rendered *darnel* (*Lolium temulentum*), a weed of a poisonous nature. The darnel before it comes into ear is very similar in appearance to wheat, though afterwards easily distinguishable from it. Very often also, "the roots of the two plants are so intertwined, that it is impossible to separate them without plucking up both" (Thomson, 'Land and Book,' p. 420). Cf. Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' Article *Tares*.

**30.** *Let both grow together, &c.*] "Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good," yet the evil, though *in* the Church, are not *of* it, though they may outwardly and apparently remain in it. See Archbishop Trench for some interesting remarks on the use made of this parable in the controversy with the Donatists.

**31.** *Another parable.*] This parable and the following are given in a different place, and with a different context, by St. Luke xiii. 18-21. Neither of the Evangelists gives any distinct note of time (in the original of St. Luke there is no equivalent to the *then* of the Authorised Version), but the probability is in favour of St. Luke's arrangement. The triumph of our Lord over His adversaries (verse 17) is an appropriate occasion on which to speak of the growth of His kingdom, while the position of the parables in St. Matthew may be easily explained by the affinity of the subject to the parable of the sower, to which they are appended. In St. Mark, also, the former parable occurs in a similar collection of parables on the same subject.

*a grain of mustard seed.*] It has been questioned whether the plant commonly known by this name is here meant, or the tree known as the *Salvadora Persica*, whose seeds have a similar quality and are employed for the same purposes as mustard. The latter better answers to the description in the text, that it "becometh a tree;" but on the other hand it would not be so accurately described as "the greatest among herbs." The common mustard plant grows in Palestine to a size which would justify its being spoken of as more resembling a tree than a herb. Dr. Thomson ('Land and Book,' p. 414) speaks of some "as tall as the horse and his rider" (the doubtful testimony of some Rabbinical writers, cited by Lightfoot, goes far beyond this); by "the birds of the air," are probably meant small birds which settle on the plant to pick the seeds.

(The note of Maldonatus referred to by Archbishop Trench is important. "How can it become a tree, being an herb, some ask and dispute, who, as I suppose, have not seen the mustard plant. In very warm places it rises far above the height of a man. I have often seen in Spain large ovens heated by the mustard plant in place of wood. Birds are exceedingly fond of its seed, and when it is ripened settle on its branches, which are strong enough to bear them, however numerous they may be." The proverbial sayings of the Rabbins which take the mustard seed as the representative of smallest objects, are collected by Wetstein. Among them one bears also directly upon the size and strength of the herb. "Rabbi Simeon said, 'I had a stalk of mustard in my garden, up which I climbed as one climbs to the top of a fig-tree.'" It is singular that Meyer, following Royle, should still hold that a tree (the *Salvadora Persica*) is meant. F. C. C.)

*the least of all seeds.*] Literally, *less than all seeds*. These words need not be strictly interpreted, as the mustard seed was a proverbial type for anything very small. (See ch. xvii. 20, and the Rabbinical proverbs cited by Lightfoot.) It may also be understood, as Dr.

e Luke 13. 20.
‖ The word in the Greek is, *a measure containing about a peck and a half, wanting a little more than a pint.*
f Mark 4. 33.
g Ps. 78. 2.

33 ¶ e Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three ‖measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.

34 f All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them:

35 That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, g I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.

36 Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field.

37 He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man;

38 The field is the world; the

---

Thomson remarks, that the mustard was the smallest of the seeds which the husbandman was accustomed to sow, while the plant, when full grown, was larger than any other herb in his garden. The comparison of the growth of a kingdom to a tree is frequent in the Old Testament (see Ps. lxxx. 8, Ezek. xvii. 22-24, xxxi. 3-9; Dan. iv. 10-12).

**33.** *like unto leaven.*] "This parable relates also to the marvellous increase of the kingdom of God; but, while the last set forth its outward visible manifestation, this declares its hidden mysterious working, its influence on the world which on all sides it touches." (Archbishop Trench.) Though *leaven* is most frequently used in Scripture as a symbol of evil (see Luke xii. 1; 1 Cor. v. 8; Gal. v. 9), this is no reason why it may not be employed here in a good sense, to denote the penetrating power of the Gospel. Not only does the preceding parable naturally suggest this interpretation, but the other exposition is involved in insuperable difficulties. If, as is most natural, we understand the "three measures of meal" to signify the world, that exposition would make the Church an evil influence in the world. If, on the other hand, they are made less naturally to signify the Church, the parable must represent the whole Church as becoming one mass of evil, which is contrary to the whole language of Scripture, and to the tenor of all the other parables in this place.

*a woman.*] The office of bread-making being in ancient times usually assigned to women, it seems hardly necessary to seek for any figurative meaning (such as *the Church*, or *the Divine Wisdom*) in one of the natural accessaries of the parable.

*three measures of meal.*] This expression also has been sometimes figuratively interpreted as signifying the three parts then known of the world, or the three families of mankind descended from the sons of Noah, or the three parts of man, body, soul, and spirit. But such explanations seem unnecessary when we remember that "three measures" (*i. e.* three *sata* or *seahs*, equivalent to one ephah) was a quantity commonly used at one time (see Gen. xviii. 6; Judg. vi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 24). "The three measures," indeed, seems to have been a recognised term for the ephah (see the LXX version of Exod. xvi. 36; Isai. v. 10, compared with Gen. xviii. 6).

**35.** *by the prophet.*] Asaph, the writer of the 78th Psalm, called "Asaph the seer," 2 Chron. xxix. 30. This psalm is described as consisting of *parables* or *dark sayings*, probably because God, speaking by the prophet, does not directly declare His purpose towards the newly established house and kingdom of David, but leaves it to be gathered from the history of His past dealings with His people. Thus this teaching is typical of that of Christ, who in like manner veiled the purposes of God with regard to the new kingdom of heaven in parables whose meaning was hidden from the careless and made known only to those who diligently sought for it. The first part of the Evangelist's citation exactly agrees with the LXX; the second part is rather an application than an exact translation, being extended from the history of Israel referred to in the psalm to God's purposes from the beginning with regard to the whole world.

**38.** *The field is the world.*] Yet the parable is introduced as relating to the kingdom of heaven, *i.e.* to the Church. But there is no discrepancy. The Church is in the world, and the world existed before the planting of the Church, just as the field existed before the sowing of the seed. The Church in the world (figured by the twofold crop in the field) will contain among its nominal members the evil as well as the good, till the harvest, when it is removed from the field of the world to the barn of heaven.

*the children of the kingdom.*] "Not in the same sense as in ch. viii. 12: *sons there*, by covenant and external privilege, *here*, by the effectual grace of adoption." (Alford.)

good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked *one;*

39 The enemy that sowed them is the devil; [k]the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels.

40 As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world.

41 The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all [1]things that offend, and them which do iniquity;

42 And shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

43 [l]Then shall the righteous shine forth as the Son in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

k Joel 3. 13. Rev. 14. 15

1 Or, *scandals.*

l Dan. 12. 3

44 ¶ Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.

45 ¶ Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls:

46 Who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.

47 ¶ Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind:

48 Which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away.

49 So shall it be at the end of the

---

**44.** *like unto a treasure.*] This and the following parable, which were spoken, not to the multitude, but to the disciples in the house, differ from the preceding ones in that they represent the Church in its relation to the individual believer, not to the world in general. In the first, however, it should be observed that it is the eagerness of the man to possess himself of the treasure at any price which alone forms the point of comparison and commendation. The means adopted, that of purchasing the field while concealing its value from the owner (for this seems implied in the narrative) is not commended any more than the dishonesty of the unjust steward is commended along with his wisdom. In the present case, indeed, this feature of the parable is from the very nature of the case excluded from the comparison. A worldly treasure can only be obtained by one man through being parted with by another: the blessings of the Gospel may be shared by all without being diminished to any one. The point of comparison consists solely in the *appropriation* to oneself, not in the *transfer* from another.

**45.** *like unto a merchant man.*] This parable differs from the preceding only in the character and circumstances of the disciple represented. In the former case he is regarded as finding the treasure by accident; in this case he is diligently seeking for the pearls. "We might instance," says Archbishop Trench, "Nathanael as an example of the more receptive nature, of one who has the truth found for him; or a still more striking example, the Samaritan woman, who was thinking of anything rather than of lighting on the hid treasure, when she came to draw water from the well .... On the other hand, we have perhaps no such instance of a noble nature seeking the pearl of great price, and not resting till he had found it, as that which Augustine gives of himself in his 'Confessions;' though we have also many more, such as Justin Martyr's account of his own conversion, in which he tells us how he had travelled through the whole circle of Greek philosophy, seeking everywhere for that which would satisfy the deepest needs of his soul, and ever seeking in vain, till he found it at length in the Gospel of Christ."

**47.** *a net.*] *I.e.* a draw-net. The word in the original is different from that used at ch. iv. 18, signifying a casting-net. The signification of this parable is nearly the same as that of the tares, but with reference to a different point of time. In that, the stress is chiefly laid on the continuance of the mixture of good and evil in the Church during the present state; in this, on the final separation at the end of the world. We should not press the circumstance that the same persons are apparently represented as drawing the net and separating the fish. The "fishers of men," though implied, are not expressly mentioned; the separation, as in the parable of the tares, is made by the angels.

**48.** *bad.*] Literally, *unsound;* perhaps, as Hammond paraphrases, "that which was sick or unwholesome at the season."

world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just,

50 And shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

51 Jesus saith unto them, Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, Yea, Lord.

52 Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe *which is* instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man *that is* an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure *things* new and old.

53 ¶ And it came to pass, *that* when Jesus had finished these parables, he departed thence.

[a] Mark 6. 1. Luke 4. 16.

54 [a] And when he was come into his own country, he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, Whence hath this *man* this wisdom, and *these* mighty works?

55 [b] Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James and Joses and Simon, and Judas?

[b] John 6. 42.

56 And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this *man* all these things?

57 And they were offended in him. But Jesus said unto them, [c] A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house.

[c] Mark 6. 4. Luke 4. 24. John 4. 44.

58 And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.

---

51. *Yea, Lord.*] Three MSS omit the last word, but it is retained by all other MSS, ancient versions, and Fathers. F. C. C.

52. *Therefore.*] To this end, in order that his hearers may understand, the instructed teacher brings forward his new doctrines in conjunction with, and by means of, things familiar to them.

53. *he departed thence.*] From Mark iv. 35 we learn that on the evening of this day He crossed the lake to the country of the Gadarenes, stilling the tempest during His passage. The narrative of Mark iv. 35 to v. 43 answering to Matt. viii. 18-34, ix. 10-34, should probably come in here, between verses 53 and 54. (See note at the end of ch. ix.)

53–58. PREACHING AT NAZARETH.

54. *into his own country.*] *I.e.* Nazareth, see on ch. ix. 1. It has been questioned whether this visit to Nazareth, same as that narrated in Mark vi. 1-6, is also identical with that of Luke iv. 16, where see note. It seems most probable, as maintained by Wieseler, Tischendorf, Krafft, and Meyer, that the two visits are distinct from each other. In addition to the difficulty of chronological arrangement on the supposition of their identity, there seems to be a distinct recognition by St. Matthew of an earlier ministry of our Lord in Nazareth prior to His residence in Capernaum, corresponding to that given in detail by St. Luke. (See above, on ch. iv. 13.)

55. *his brethren, James, &c.*] See note at the end of this chapter, on the brethren of the Lord.

*Joses.*] The MSS in this place vary between three readings, *Joses*, *Joseph*, and *John*. The last is clearly an error, perhaps due to a confusion of James the brother of Joses with James the son of Zebedee. The reading *Joseph* is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, and seems to have some preponderance of MS authority in its favour. But, on the other hand, in the parallel passage (Mark vi. 3) the whole weight of MS authority (followed by the above editors) is in favour of the reading *Joses*, varying only between two forms of the genitive case: to which it may be added that *Joseph*, as the more common form of the name, is the one more likely to have been substituted for the other by way of explanation. These considerations seem to point to the reading of the text as the true one.

## NOTE ON THE BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

Three principal hypotheses have been maintained concerning the brethren of the Lord.

I. The hypothesis maintained by Helvidius and others in the fourth century, and by some modern critics, that they were actual uterine brothers of our Lord, the sons of Joseph and Mary.

II. The hypothesis originally derived from the apocryphal gospel of Peter or the Protevangelium of James (see Origen on Matt. xiii. 55), and adopted by the majority of the Greek Fathers, that they were legal half-brothers of our Lord, the sons of Joseph by a former marriage. This is distinguished by Dr. Lightfoot as the *Epiphanian* hypothesis, being maintained by that father against the Antidicomarianitæ.

III. The hypothesis supported by St. Jerome, and generally adopted in the Latin Church, that they were cousins of our Lord, the sons of Clopas (or Alphæus) and Mary his wife, mentioned John xix. 25.

The second hypothesis, which has found but little favour in later times, has recently been revived and defended with great learning by Dr. Lightfoot in his edition of the Epistle to the Galatians. The amount of ecclesiastical authority adduced in its support (even deducting one or two writers who appear to have been rather pressed into the service[1]), is no doubt considerable. But, on the other hand, it can claim no special support from Scripture evidence, and it shares with the first or Helvidian hypothesis in all the objections which may be urged against the separation of James the Lord's brother from James the son of Alphæus. The Scripture arguments against both these suppositions, and in favour of the third, are as follows:—

(1) There is evidence of the existence of four sons of Clopas and Mary, named James, Joses, Simon (or Symeon), and Judas. Mary the wife of Clopas (John xix. 25) is the mother of James the Less and of Joses (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40). Judas, the brother of James (Luke xi. 16; Acts i. 13), can hardly be referred to any other James than the son of Alphæus just before mentioned, and finally Symeon the son of Clopas is mentioned in the fragments of Hegesippus, and elsewhere (apud Euseb., 'H. E.' iii. 32, iv. 22). On the identity of the names *Clopas* and *Alphæus*, see above on ch. x. 3.

(2) According to the most probable interpretation of John xix. 25, Mary the wife of Clopas is called the sister of the Virgin, and her children therefore would be cousins of our Lord. Early ecclesiastical tradition makes them legal cousins on the father's side also, Joseph and Clopas being brothers (Hegesippus apud Euseb., 'H. E.' iii. 11). The above interpretation of John xix. 25 is most natural, because the omission of the conjunction between "his mother's sister" and "Mary the wife of Clopas" seems to refer both to the same person. The objection from the improbability of two sisters being both called Mary is of little weight. In the first place, the term *sister* may possibly indicate a more remote relation, such as that of first cousins, in which case the brethren of our Lord would be on the mother's side his second cousins. In the second place there are instances of a repetition of the same name even in the case of actual brethren. Among the sons of Herod the Great we find in like manner two Herods "Herod the tetrarch" (whose second name, Antipas, again is but another form of that of his brother Antipater), and a son by Cleopatra, and two Philips, the tetrarch and the husband of Herodias; and again, among the sons of Aristobulus, Herod Agrippa ("Herod the king," Acts xii. 1), and his brother Herod, king of Chalcis. But this interpretation is not necessary to the relationship, which would be legally established by the brotherhood of Joseph and Clopas.]

(3) The term *brethren* is frequently used in Scripture of other near relatives; of Abram and Lot (Gen. xiv. 14), and Jacob and Laban (Gen. xxix. 12-15); of the cousins of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 4); of uncles and their sons (Lev. xxv. 48, 49); and probably also of the uncles of Jeconias (see on ch. i. 11). So also Isaac calls Rebekah his sister (Gen. xxvi. 7), probably because she was his cousin; and the brethren of Ahaziah (2 Kings x. 13) are called the sons of his brethren (2 Chr. xxii. 8), and probably were in reality his cousins, the sons of the brethren of his father Jehoram, mentioned 2 Chr. xxi. 2, 4. (See Greswell's 'Dissertations,' vol. ii. p. 117.)

[1] Such appears to be the case at least with Hegesippus and Clement of Alexandria. The former (apud Euseb., 'H. E.' iii. 32) speaks of Symeon, the son of Clopas, as the son of the Lord's uncle; while in another fragment (*ibid.* iv. 22) he seems, according to the most natural interpretation of his language, to speak of the same Symeon as "a second kinsman of the Lord," his predecessor James being apparently regarded as the first. And Clement (apud Euseb., 'H. E.' ii. 1), though not distinctly denying the existence of a third James, seems clearly to regard James the Just as having been an apostle during the forty days after our Lord's resurrection.

(4) Our Lord on the cross commended His mother to the care of St. John, in whose home she resided from that hour. This of itself makes it improbable that she had sons of her own. This argument is not met by the reply that the sons were probably unbelievers; for the "brethren" appear as believers very shortly afterwards (Acts i. 14). This objection is allowed by Dr. Lightfoot to be fatal to the Helvidian hypothesis, though not decisive between the other two.

(5) James, the Lord's brother, was an apostle, according to the most natural interpretation of Gal. i. 19. This seems to identify him with the son of Alphæus. The supposition that he was an additional apostle, like Paul and Barnabas, is very improbable. On that supposition he must have been called to the apostolate within three years from the conversion of St. Paul, *i. e.* within the period in which St. Luke relates the most important acts of the Apostolic body. Yet no mention is made of such a call, while that of Matthias as well as of Paul and Barnabas is expressly mentioned (Acts i. 26, xiii. 2). Moreover, in the absence of special revelation to the contrary, as in the case of Paul and Barnabas, it was required that a new apostle should have been a disciple during the Lord's ministry (Acts i. 21).

(6) The James of Gal. ii. 12 can hardly have been different from the James of Acts xv. 13. But the former must almost necessarily be identified with "James the Lord's brother" (Gal. i. 19), while it is natural to identify the latter with James, the son of Alphæus (Acts i. 13), no hint being given in the Acts of the existence of any other James, except the son of Zebedee, who was now dead.

(7) The important position assigned to James at the council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 13) is one more likely to have been given to one of the Twelve than to a later convert.

The strongest argument on the other side is derived from the testimony of John vii. 5; the unbelief of the brethren there mentioned being subsequent to the call of the Apostles. But there is not the slightest necessity to understand the words of St. John as including all the brethren. It obviously relates to those spoken of in verse 3, who might have been all or some. Even if James and Judas were at this time among the Twelve, it is quite possible that Joses and Simon (whom there is no need to identify with Simon Zelotes), as well as the sisters, may have been still unbelievers, though their subsequent conversion may be inferred from Acts i. 14.

Another argument for the actual brotherhood is derived from the mention of the Mother of the Lord in conjunction with His Brethren. But if, as is probable, Joseph was at this time dead (see note on ch. xii. 46), and possibly Clopas also, there is no improbability in the supposition that the two widowed sisters may have been living together, and regarded as members of one family.

The weight of the above two arguments, such as it is, tells, however, only against the hypothesis of Jerome, and decides nothing as between the other two. On the whole, the result appears to be that the Hieronymian theory is better supported by the evidence of Scripture, and the Epiphanian by Ecclesiastical tradition. The Helvidian is decidedly weaker than either, the arguments urged in its support being equally compatible with the Epiphanian, while it is liable to grave objections peculiar to itself. For a fuller discussion of the subject, see Mr. Meyrick's article *James*, in Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' or Lange's article *Jacobus*, in Herzog's 'Real-Encyclopädie.' The arguments on the other side are fully stated in Dean Alford's Prolegomena to the Greek Epistle of St. James, and more briefly in his note on the present text.

(In Renan's late work, 'Les Evangiles,' there is an appendix, pp. 537-549, in which very strong, if not conclusive, arguments are adduced in favour of what is called the Epiphanian hypothesis. He holds that St. James, the brother of our Lord, first Bishop of Jerusalem, St. Jude, and others unnamed, were children of Joseph by a former marriage, and that our Lord was the only son of Mary; he quotes Mark vi. 3 (where see note) in support of this view. F. C. C.)

## CHAPTER XIV.

1 *Herod's opinion of Christ.* 3 *Wherefore John Baptist was beheaded.* 13 *Jesus departeth into a desert place:* 15 *where he feedeth five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes:* 22 *he walketh on the sea to his disciples:* 34 *and landing at Gennesaret, healeth the sick by the touch of the hem of his garment.*

AT that time [d] Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus.

2 And said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works [1] do shew forth themselves in him.

3 ¶ [e] For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put *him* in

[d] Mark 6. 14. Luke 9. 7.

[1] Or, *are wrought by him.*

[e] Luke 3. 19.

---

CHAP. XIV.—1–12. HEROD AND JOHN BAPTIST.

1. *At that time.*] St. Mark and St. Luke mention this circumstance in connection with the mission of the Twelve, and apparently represent Herod's hearing of the fame of Jesus as a consequence of the preaching of the Apostles. This portion of the present gospel will therefore come after ch. xi. 1, the intermediate narrative belonging to an earlier period. On the meaning of the expression *at that time*, see on ch. xi. 25.

*Herod.*] This was Herod Antipas, the son of Herod the Great, and Malthace, who was also the mother of Archelaus. (Josephus, 'B. J.' i. 28, § 4.) He received from Augustus, according to his father's will, the territories of Galilee and Peræa (see on ch. ii. 22); he was afterwards banished together with Herodias by Caligula, to Lyons, and from thence removed to Spain, where he died. (Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. 7, § 1, 2; 'B. J.' ii. 9, § 6.)

*the tetrarch.*] This title properly signifies the ruler of the fourth part of a territory, but was more generally applied, as a title of sovereignty inferior to that of king, to the ruler of a portion of a territory. It was properly applied in this instance, for Herod Antipas and Philip each held a quarter of their father's kingdom, the remaining half having been originally assigned to Archelaus, and afterwards reduced to a Roman province. (See Josephus, 'Ant.' xvii. 11, § 4; 'B. J.' ii. 6, § 3.)

2. *This is John the Baptist.*] From Luke ix. 7 it appears that this opinion did not originate with Herod, but was adopted from a popular rumour. From Mark viii. 15, compared with Matthew xvi. 6, it has sometimes been inferred that Herod was a Sadducee. The inference is by no means certain; yet it is possible that his alarmed conscience may have prompted a momentary confession opposed to his habitual disbelief.

3. *For Herod had laid hold, &c.*] From ch. iv. 12 (cf. Mark i. 14) we learn that the imprisonment of the Baptist took place shortly before our Lord's second visit to Galilee, the events of which are recorded by St. John, ch. iv. John was still living at the time of our Lord's third visit to Galilee (ch. xi. 2), but was put to death before the end of it, probably shortly before the feeding of the five thousand, which took place nearly at the time of the Passover (John vi. 4). The duration of the Baptist's imprisonment may therefore be reckoned as beginning a short time before the feast of the Jews, mentioned John v. 1, and as ending shortly before the next Passover. If the former feast was a Passover, which may be maintained on plausible grounds, the imprisonment must have lasted about a year. If, with Wieseler and some other modern critics, we regard the feast of John v. 1, as Purim, only a month would elapse between this and the following Passover, which seems to allow too short a period for those events of our Lord's third journey, which took place before the death of John. Those who, with Wieseler, identify the journey of Matthew iv. 12 with that of John vi. 1, instead of that of John iv. 1, allow only three weeks for the duration of the Baptist's imprisonment, which seems inconsistent with Mark vi. 20.

3. *in prison.*] According to Josephus ('Ant.' xviii. 5, § 2) the place of John's imprisonment was the Castle of Machærus, on the southern boundary of Peræa. But there is a difficulty in reconciling this statement with the assertion in the same chapter, that Machærus was subject to Aretas, the father-in-law, and at this time the enemy, of Herod. If both statements are correct, we must suppose that Machærus had passed from the hands of Aretas to those of Herod, in the brief interval between the departure of Herod's wife to her father and the imprisonment of the Baptist. It is possible that the business which took Herod to Rome at this time and in which he succeeded (Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. 5, § 1), might have given him this accession of territory. (Cf. Wieseler, 'Chron. Synops.' p. 221, Eng. Tr., whose general argument may be adopted without confining ourselves to the exact limits of his chronology.)

*Herodias.*] This woman was the daughter of Aristobulus, son of Herod the Great, and the sister of Herod Agrippa, the "Herod the king" of Acts xii. 1. By the father's side,

prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife.

4 For John said unto him, [f]It is not lawful for thee to have her.

[f] Lev. 18. 16. & 20. 21.

5 And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, [g]because they counted him as a prophet.

[g] ch. 21. 26.

6 But when Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod.

7 Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask.

8 And she, being before instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger.

9 And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded *it* to be given *her*.

10 And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison.

11 And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the damsel: and she brought *it* to her mother.

12 And his disciples came, and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Jesus.

13 ¶ [h]When Jesus heard *of it*, he departed thence by ship into a desert place apart: and when the people had heard *thereof*, they followed him on foot out of the cities.

[h] Mark 6. 32. Luke 9. 10.

14 And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and he healed their sick.

---

therefore, she was niece both to Philip and to Herod Antipas, and thus both her marriages were unlawful by inference from Levit. xviii. 13. This law, however, was but little regarded by the family of Herod. (See Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. 5, § 4.)

3. *Philip.*] Not the tetrarch, but another son of Herod the Great, by Mariamne the daughter of Simon the high priest. He was disinherited by his father, and lived in a private station. (See Josephus, 'B. J.' i. 30, § 6.) This Philip is called by Josephus simply Herod; but this being common to others of the family, he may also have had a distinguishing name, like his brother Herod Antipas, by which he is here called. There is nothing more extraordinary in there being two Philips in this family than in there being two Antipaters.

4. *It is not lawful.*] Not only on account of her marriage with Philip (see Levit. xviiii. 16, xx. 21), but also because both Philip the husband of Herodias, and the daughter of Aretas, the wife of Herod Antipas, were still living. (See Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. 5, § 2, 4.)

5. *he would have put him to death.*] There is no antagonism between this statement and that of Mark vi. 19, 20. There was a struggle in Herod's mind between his desire to remove the man who had rebuked this sin, and the restraining motives, partly from fear of the people, partly from the respect which, in his better moments, he could not help feeling for the Baptist himself. St. Matthew lays more stress on one aspect of these conflicting motives, St. Mark on the other.

6. *Herod's birthday.*] It is disputed whether this expression is to be understood literally of the anniversary of Herod's birth, or figuratively of that of his accession to the throne. Some ingenious arguments in favour of the latter interpretation are advanced by Wieseler ('Chr. Syn.' p. 266, Eng. Tr.), who is followed by Tischendorf ('Synops. Evang.' p. xxxii. 2nd Ed.).

*the daughter of Herodias.*] Salome, the daughter of Herodias by Philip. She was afterwards married to her uncle Philip the tetrarch, and, after his death, to Antipater the brother of Herod Agrippa. (See Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. 5, § 4.)

8. *being before instructed.*] Rather, **being instigated.** Grimm, προβιβάζω, incito, instigo. See note on Mark vi. 24. F. C. C.

10. *And he sent.*] The narrative implies that Herod was at this time residing close to the place of John's imprisonment, either at Machærus or Julias.

13–20. FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.

13. *When Jesus heard of it.*] This intelligence seems to have arrived simultaneously with the return of the Twelve from their mission. (See Mark vi. 30; Luke ix. 10.) The report which identified Jesus with John must have arisen and been adopted by Herod immediately after the Baptist's death. This suspicion of Herod's, coupled with his desire to see Jesus (Luke ix. 9), would furnish a reason for our Lord's withdrawing Himself from his dominions.

*into a desert place.*] St. Luke speaks of it as "a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida." This was in the country of Gaulonitis in the tetrarchy of Philip.

[i] Mark 6. 35. John 6. 5.

15 ¶ [i] And when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals.

16 But Jesus said unto them, They need not depart; give ye them to eat.

17 And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes.

18 He said, Bring them hither to me.

19 And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass, and took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves to *his* disciples, and the disciples to the multitude.

20 And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up of the fragments that remained twelve baskets full.

21 And they that had eaten were about five thousand men, beside women and children.

22 ¶ And straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him unto the other side, while he sent the multitudes away.

---

**15.** *the time is now past.*] *I.e.* the time of day is now late.

**16.** *give ye them.*] From the more minute account of this miracle given by St. John, we learn that these words were addressed to Philip, and that the reply in verse 17 was made by Andrew.

**20.** *twelve baskets.*] The word used here and in the parallel places of the other three gospels, and rendered *basket*, is different from that employed in the account of the feeding of the four thousand (Matt. xv. 37; Mark viii. 8). The former word (κόφινος) is a basket used by the Jews in travelling to hold their food. (See Juvenal, iii. 15; vi. 542.) The latter word (σπύρις) denotes a large basket capable of holding a man's body. It is the word used in describing the escape of St. Paul (Acts ix. 25). The constant observance of this distinction, which would probably have been lost in the transmission of the narrative to a narrative at third or fourth hand, seems to mark the impression produced on the minds of eye-witnesses and the formation of the text from immediate testimony.

**21.** *beside women and children.*] Professor Blunt notices a remarkable indication of truth and accuracy in this narrative, presented by the comparison of the above expression with John vi. 10. (Blunt, 'Undesigned Coincidences,' iv. 12.) The word *men*, which occurs twice in our translation of the latter verse, represents two separate words in the original, the first (ἄνθρωποι) equivalent to *people;* the second (ἄνδρες) limited to the male sex. This would seem as if the men sat separately (in companies of fifty, Luke ix. 14), so as to be easily numbered, while the women and children were otherwise disposed of. This arrangement, only *inferred* from St. John, is directly *asserted* by St. Matthew.

**22.** The narrative from this point to ch. xvi. 12 is peculiar to St. Matthew and St. Mark. St. Luke omits all the occurrences between the feeding of the five thousand and the confession of St. Peter.

22–36. THE RETURN TO GENNESARET.

**22.** *unto the other side.*] St. Mark adds, "towards Bethsaida." This implies the existence of a second Bethsaida on the western shore of the lake near Capernaum, distinct from Bethsaida Julias at the mouth of the Jordan. The existence of a second Bethsaida is supported by John xii. 21, who speaks of "Bethsaida of Galilee," whereas Bethsaida Julias was in Gaulonitis, and would be further confirmed if we could trust the statement of Seetzen's informants, who gave the name Bât-Szaida to Khan Minyeh at the northern extremity of the Plain of Gennesaret. (On this point compare Robinson's 'Researches,' iii. 296, with Ritter's 'Geography of Palestine,' ii. 269, and see note on Mark, *l.c.*) Yet it is not absolutely necessary to adopt this hypothesis. If we suppose that the desert belonging to Bethsaida was at some distance from the city itself and on the eastern shore of the lake, a vessel sailing from thence towards the city at the mouth of the Jordan would also sail in the direction of Capernaum (John vi. 17), supposing the latter to be situated on the site of modern Tell Hûm. (See on ch. iv. 13.) The expression, "Bethsaida of Galilee" may be explained if we suppose the city to have been extended to both sides of the Jordan.

On this hypothesis, we may suppose that the disciples sailed towards Capernaum, keeping near the shore, intending to touch at Bethsaida and take in their Master, who would otherwise have to cross the Jordan to join them. But as the wind was contrary

Mark 6. k

John 6. l

23 [k] And when he had sent the multitudes away, he went up into a mountain apart to pray: [l] and when the evening was come, he was there alone.

24 But the ship was now in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves: for the wind was contrary.

25 And in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went unto them, walking on the sea.

26 And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear.

27 But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.

28 And Peter answered him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water.

29 And he said, Come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus.

30 But when he saw the wind [1] boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me.

[1] Or, *strong*.

31 And immediately Jesus stretched forth *his* hand, and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?

32 And when they were come into the ship, the wind ceased.

33 Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth, thou art the Son of God.

---

they could neither land at Bethsaida nor at Capernaum, but were carried on toward the plain of Gennesaret, where they landed. (See Thomson's 'The Land and the Book,' pp. 360, 372.)

**23.** *when he had sent the multitudes away.*] St. John relates this incident more circumstantially. Our Lord parted from the multitude when He perceived that they wished to make Him a king, being convinced by the miracle that He was the Messiah.

*into a mountain.*] Literally, "into the mountain," *i.e.* the mountainous part of that region.

*when the evening was come.*] *I.e.* the second evening, after sunset: the evening of verse 15 is the first evening, from the ninth hour till sunset. (Compare the expression "between the two evenings," Exod. xii. 6, marginal rendering, Authorised Version.)

**25.** *in the fourth watch.*] According to the Roman mode of reckoning, by which the night was divided into four watches, enumerated Mark xiii. 35. The Jews originally had three watches (see Judg. vii. 19), but after their conquest by Pompey they adopted the Roman mode of reckoning. (See Wieseler, 'Synopsis,' p. 371, note; Eng. Tr.)

**26.** *a spirit.*] Literally, a phantasm or apparition.

**28.** *And Peter answered.*] This incident is narrated by St. Matthew alone; though the earlier part of the narrative is found in St. Mark and St. John. The incident is quite in accordance with St. Peter's character, exhibiting the same confidence and the same subsequent fear as was afterwards shown in his denial.

**33.** *the Son of God.*] This is the first occasion recorded by St. Matthew, on which this title is given to our Lord by men. In the Temptation it is employed by the Tempter (ch. iv. 3, 6), and again by the evil spirit (ch. viii. 29). How this expression came to be used by those to whom it is here attributed, is a question of some difficulty. No doubt the doctrine of the Divine Sonship of the Messiah is contained in the Old Testament (see especially Ps. ii. 7, and cf. Dan. iii. 25), but there is no evidence that the majority of the Jews of this day had elicited this truth from their own Scriptures; and there is positive evidence that at a later period they neither acknowledged the divine origin of the Messiah nor gave Him the name of Son of God. (See Justin, 'Dial. cum Tryph.' c. 49; Origen c. Cels. i. 49.) On the whole it seems probable that the appellation could not have been derived from the current language of the day, but must have arisen from the teaching of Jesus Himself. His own disciples may have been the first to use it here. The similar language of Nathanael (John i. 50) may have been suggested by the testimony of the Baptist (John i. 34), and that of Martha (John xi. 27) by her previous knowledge of our Lord's own teaching. On the confession of St. Peter, see below on ch. xvi. 16. The question is ably discussed in Wilson's 'Illustrations of the New Testament,' ch. iv., who is in the main followed by Bishop Wordsworth in Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' Art. *Son of God.* Some slight evidence in favour

ⁿ Mark 6. 53.

34 ¶ ⁿ And when they were gone over, they came into the land of Gennesaret.

35 And when the men of that place had knowledge of him, they sent out into all that country round about, and brought unto him all that were diseased;

36 And besought him that they might only touch the hem of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole.

## CHAPTER XV.

*3 Christ reproveth the scribes and Pharisees for transgressing God's commandments through their own traditions: 11 teacheth how that which goeth into the mouth doth not defile a man. 21 He healeth the daughter of the woman of Canaan, 30 and other great multitudes: 32 and with seven loaves and a few little fishes feedeth four thousand men, beside women and children.*

THEN ⁿ came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying,

ⁿ Mark 7. 1.

2 Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread.

3 But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?

4 For God commanded, saying, ᵒ Honour thy father and mother: and,

ᵒ Ex. 20. 12. Deut. 5. 16

---

of a contrary view may be found in the use of the term "Son of God" in the 'Book of Enoch,' a work probably written rather more than a century before Christ, but the traces of Christian interpolation in the present text of the work throw much doubt on its testimony. The utmost, however, that such evidence can shew would be that a few pious Jews, before and at the time of Christ's coming, had higher views of the Messiah's person than were held by the mass of their countrymen.

**34.** *the land of Gennesaret.*] The plain on the western side of the lake which gave one of its names to the lake itself. The earliest title by which the lake is mentioned is "the sea of Chinnereth" (Numb. xxxiv. 11; Josh. xii. 3, xiii. 27).

### CHAP. XV.—1-20. THE PRINCIPLE OF DEFILEMENT.

**1.** *Then came.*] The discourse recorded by St. John (vi. 22-65) took place in the synagogue at Capernaum on the day after the event narrated in the last chapter. Wieseler ('Chron. Syn.,' p. 281, Eng. Tr.) supposes that the discourse in the present chapter to verse 20, which St. Mark also gives in the same connection, took place on the same day with that in St. John. Against this it may be argued that the persons with whom our Lord spoke on this occasion were Scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem who would probably have remained in that city during the time of the Passover. It seems more probable, therefore, that a break must be made between the end of the former and the beginning of the present chapter (as between Mark vi. and vii.), and an interval of a few days supposed to intervene; or perhaps the cures recorded ch. xiv. 35, 36, may have occupied some days. (See Tischendorf, 'Syn. Evang.,' pp. xxxiii., xxxiv.)

*the tradition of the elders.*] *I.e.* of the ancients. (Cf. Hebr. xi. 2.) Compare the explanatory statement of St. Mark vii. 3, 4, respecting the practice of the Pharisees. The Scribes and Pharisees regarded these traditions as of greater weight than the written law (see Lightfoot on this passage), a doctrine which our Lord repudiates by distinguishing "your tradition" from "the commandment of God." These oral expositions of the Law, which, after accumulating through successive generations, were subsequently (about 200 A.D.) collected into a code which, with its commentary, ultimately assumed the form of the two Talmuds, were regarded by later Jewish tradition as having been revealed to Moses along with the written law, and communicated by him to the elders of the people. It is probable that this origin may have been claimed for their traditional teaching by the Scribes and Pharisees contemporary with Christ, but there is no trustworthy evidence to shew a higher antiquity than the time of the return from the Captivity. Indeed the neglect of the Law itself in the generation before the Captivity (see 2 Kings xxii. 8-13; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 15-33) would seem to imply the absence of any acknowledged traditional exposition of it. After the return from the Captivity, with the cessation of the Urim and Thummim and of Prophecy, the necessity of human exposition in adapting the old theocratic constitution to a new state of things would naturally give rise, by degrees, to an organised system of comment and application,

b Ex. 21. 17. Lev. 20. 9. Prov. 20. 20.

b He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death.

c Mark 7. 11, 12.

5 But ye say, Whosoever shall say to *his* father or *his* mother, c *It is* a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me;

6 And honour not his father or his mother, *he shall be free.* Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.

7 *Ye* hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying,

a Isai. 29. 13.

8 a This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with *their* lips; but their heart is far from me.

9 But in vain they do worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men.

b Mark 7. 14.

10 ¶ b And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand:

11 Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man.

12 Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying?

13 But he answered and said, c Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.

c John 15. 2.

14 Let them alone: d they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.

d Luke 6. 39.

15 e Then answered Peter and said unto him, Declare unto us this parable.

e Mark 7. 17.

16 And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without understanding?

17 Do not ye yet understand, that

---

and might lead sometimes, as in the present case, to glosses subversive of the spirit of the text.

5. *It is a gift.*] *I.e.* Devoted to sacred purposes. Perhaps the ellipsis should rather be supplied by "let it be a gift." This form of speech did not bind the speaker to devote his property to sacred uses, but merely restrained him by vow from applying it to the support of his parents. (See Lightfoot on this passage.) The Pharisees taught that such a vow was of higher obligation than the natural duty.

6. *he shall be free.*] These words should rather be supplied earlier. The continuation of the sentence is, "Whosoever shall say—he shall not honour his father or his mother."

8. *This people, &c.*] The shorter form in which this text is cited (Mark vii. 6) is probably the true reading in both places. The citation nearly follows the LXX, but with some words omitted. This coincidence of the two Evangelists in a citation slightly varying from the LXX can hardly be explained, except upon the supposition either that one had seen the other's gospel or that both borrowed from a common source. At the same time there are variations in the two narratives sufficient to shew that neither is a mere copyist.

9. *But in vain do they worship me, &c.*] The present reading of this portion of the text (Isa. xxix. 13) in the Hebrew is expressed in the Authorised Version, "And their fear towards me is taught by the precept of men," or rather, "has become a precept learned from men." The LXX renders, "in vain do they worship me"—a variation which is by some supposed to arise from a different reading of the Hebrew text (the word rendered "has become" differing only slightly in form from one which signifies "in vain"), but which may perhaps be explained as a paraphrase of the present Hebrew text.

11. *Not that which goeth into, &c.*] Our Lord is not here abrogating the Mosaic distinction between clean and unclean meats; the decision of that question was reserved for another occasion. Here He merely distinguishes between ceremonial and moral defilement, and, without setting aside the former, points out that the true pollution is in the latter alone. (See, however, note on Mark vii. 19. F. C. C.)

12. *Then came his disciples.*] This discourse with the disciples took place in the house, apart from the multitude. (See Mark vii. 17.) St. Mark omits the earlier portion, verses 12-14.

15. *this parable.*] The word *parable* is here used in a loose sense for an obscure saying. (Cf. Ezek. xx. 49, where the LXX renders οὐχὶ παραβολή ἐστι λεγομένη αὕτη.) The language of verse 11 is not strictly a parable, but it has a feature of the parable proper in that invisible things are represented under visible images, the ceremonial defile-

whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught?

18 But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man.

19 [f] For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies:

[f] Gen. 6. 5. & 8. 21.

20 These are *the things* which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.

21 ¶ [g] Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.

[g] Mark 7. 24.

22 And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, *thou* son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.

23 But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, Send her away; for she crieth after us.

24 But he answered and said, [h] I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

[h] ch. 10. 6.

25 Then came she and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me.

26 But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast *it* to dogs.

27 And she said, Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table.

28 Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great *is* thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour.

29 [i] And Jesus departed from thence, and came nigh unto the sea

[i] Mark 7. 31.

---

ment of the Mosaic Law being used as an image to indicate by contrast the moral defilement of the heart.

21-28. THE CANAANITISH WOMAN.

**21.** *into the coasts.*] Literally, "into the *parts*, or *region*" (εἰς τὰ μέρη) as in ch. ii. 22.

**22.** *a woman of Canaan.*] St. Mark calls her "a Greek (*i.e.* a Gentile), a Syrophœnician by nation." The difference shews the independence of the two writers, but both appellations are equally correct, if we understand them as meaning an inhabitant of that country. The term *Canaan*, in its strictest sense, *lowland country*, included the sea-coast of Palestine, from Sidon to Gaza (Gen. x. 19; cf. Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' Art. *Canaanite* and *Phœnice*). The term *Phœnician* is used by the LXX as a translation of *Canaanite* in this sense (Josh. v. 1). In a wider sense, the term *Canaanite* was applied to all the non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine (Gen. xii. 6; Numb. xxi. 3). And, in this sense, it is a disputed question among modern scholars whether the Phœnicians of the coast were the same race with the Canaanites of the interior, and whether the Phœnicians of Joshua's time were the same race with the inhabitants of the same country in the days of David and Solomon. (See Rawlinson's 'Herodotus,' vol. iv. p. 241.) But this question does not affect the use of the two terms, interchangeably, to express an inhabitant of the maritime region to which both the terms *Canaan* and *Phœnicia* are strictly applicable. On the importance of this journey see note on Mark l. c.

**23.** *he answered her not a word.*] "That this silence on the part of our Lord was designed to prove the faith of the woman is the opinion of the ancient commentators (see Chrys. *in Matth.* Hom. lii. 2), and seems certainly borne out by the trying answer of our Lord which was vouchsafed to her second entreaty. To suppose that our Lord was here condescending to the prejudices of the Apostles is not probable or satisfactory; still less so is the supposition that He was simply overcome by her faithful importunity." Bp. Ellicott, 'Hist. Lect.' p. 218, note 1.

**25.** *Then came she.*] *I.e.* into the house where the Lord was. (See Mark vii. 24, 25.)

**27.** *yet the dogs, &c.*] Literally "*for even* the dogs eat," &c.: *i.e.* True; it is not meet to give the children's bread to the dogs, yet the dogs also have their portion in the crumbs. The Lord's mission was to the Jews; yet the overflowings of His mercy might be granted to the heathen, without diminishing the portion granted to the chosen people.

29-31. RETURN TO GALILEE.

**29.** *nigh unto the sea of Galilee.*] *I.e.* to the eastern coast of the sea, having approached it through the borders of Decapolis (see note on Mark vii. 31).

of Galilee; and went up into a mountain, and sat down there.

[k] Isai. 35. 5.

30 [k] And great multitudes came unto him, having with them *those that were* lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet; and he healed them:

31 Insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see: and they glorified the God of Israel.

[l] Mark 8. 1.

32 ¶ [l] Then Jesus called his disciples *unto him*, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat: and I will not send them away fasting, lest they faint in the way.

33 And his disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude?

34 And Jesus saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven, and a few little fishes.

35 And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the ground.

36 And he took the seven loaves and the fishes, and gave thanks, and brake *them*, and gave to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude.

37 And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up of the broken *meat* that was left seven baskets full.

38 And they that did eat were four thousand men, beside women and children.

39 And he sent away the multitude, and took ship, and came into the coasts of Magdala.

---

*into a mountain.*] Literally "into the mountain," *i.e.* the mountainous land on the coast of the lake.

**30.** *he healed them.*] One of these miracles of healing was that of the deaf and dumb man, narrated in detail by St. Mark vii. 32-37.

**31.** *they glorified the God of Israel.*] A large part of the inhabitants of this region seem to have been heathen (see on ch. iv. 25), which gives a propriety to the expression "the God of Israel." The preservation of an expression so likely to have been used under these circumstances is an incidental evidence of the accuracy of the narrative.

32-39. FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND.

Nothing can be clearer than the distinction between this miracle and that of the five thousand, as stated in our Lord's own words (ch. xvi. 9, 10; Mark viii. 19, 20). The differences between the two are pointedly shewn in the valuable remarks of Bp. Ellicott, 'Hist. Lect.' p. 221. Yet the ingenuity of several modern German commentators has discovered, in defiance of the narrative, that the two are but different statements of the same event. The reason for this modern rewriting of ancient history is because, forsooth, the disciples, if they had known of the first miracle, must have expected a repetition of it on the second occasion! Thus it is that the plainest historical testimony is set aside if the facts do not take place exactly in the manner in which a modern critic thinks they ought to have taken place. It is quite possible that our Lord's own language (verse 32) might have led the disciples to think that He did not intend to perform a miracle on this occasion; but even without discussing the probable motives of their conduct it is surely too much to expect that, on the strength of a modern conjecture of this kind, we should be required to reject as a forgery the words ascribed to our Lord Himself in referring to these two miracles as distinct. The instance, however, is instructive as a specimen of the determination of the so-called higher criticism to prefer theory to testimony. It should be observed, however, that there is a difference between the conduct of the disciples on the first and on the second occasion. On the former, they of themselves propose that the multitude should be dismissed to the villages, to buy food for themselves. On the latter, they simply confess their own inability to supply it; but they do not suggest any natural means, but leave the matter in their Master's hands. Surely such conduct is at least as probable as that they should at once have requested Him to perform another miracle. (See note on Mark viii. 8. F. C. C.)

**39.** *the coasts of Magdala.*] *I.e.* the *borders*. The oldest MSS have in this place *Magadan*, a name equally unknown with the corresponding name in St. Mark, *Dalmanutha*, but which may be another form of the word *Magdala*—the better known form preserved in the

## CHAPTER XVI.

*1 The Pharisees require a sign. 6 Jesus warneth his disciples of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. 13 The people's opinion of Christ, 16 and Peter's confession of him. 21 Jesus foresheweth his death, 23 reproving Peter for dissuading him from it: 24 and admonisheth those that will follow him, to bear the cross.*

m Mark 8. 11. Luke 12. 54.

THE m Pharisees also with the Sadducees came, and tempting desired him that he would shew them a sign from heaven.

2 He answered and said unto them, When it is evening, ye say, *It will be* fair weather: for the sky is red.

3 And in the morning, *It will be* foul weather to day: for the sky is red and lowring. O *ye* hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not *discern* the signs of the times?

4 A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas. And he left them, and departed.

5 And when his disciples were come to the other side, they had forgotten to take bread.

6 ¶ Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

---

name of Mary Magdalene. Magdala was situated about the middle of the western shore of the lake at the southern extremity of the plain of Gennesaret. Its name is still preserved in the modern village of El Mejdel on the same site (cf. Robinson, 'Researches,' iii. 278; Thomson, 'Land and Book,' p. 420). The name Magdala is another form of the Hebrew *Migdal* (*Tower*) which appears as a proper name in Migdal-El (Josh. xix. 38), and in Migdal-Gad (Josh. xv. 37), and in the cognate form Migdol (Exod. xiv. 2). The first of these places has been by some authorities identified with Magdala, but this is doubtful (see Ritter, 'Geography of Palestine,' ii. 262, Eng. Tr.). For Dalmanutha, see on Mark viii. 10.

CHAP. XVI.—1-12. REFUSAL OF A SIGN, AND WARNING.

1. *that he would shew them a sign, &c.*] The parallel between this passage and Mark viii. 11, 12 shews that the occurrence is here narrated in its chronological sequence. It is clear from St. Matthew that the sign was asked for twice, and on each occasion met with a similar answer. By a sign from heaven may perhaps be meant a portent such as those foretold by Joel ii. 30, 31. Our Lord's miracles of mercy the Pharisees ascribed to Beelzebub. They demanded a celestial sign in proof of his divine mission.

2. *When it is evening, &c.*] These words to the end of verse 3 are omitted in the abridged narrative of St. Mark, and in some of the best MSS of St. Matthew. The probability, however, is in favour of the genuineness of the passage, its omission being probably caused by the parallel passage in ch. xii. 38. Language similar but by no means identical is recorded in another connection by St. Luke xii. 54, 55. The difference of detail is in itself sufficient to distinguish the two as separate utterances, the one moreover being addressed to the Pharisees and Sadducees, the other to the people.

3. *the signs of the times.*] "The Jews were very curious in observing the seasons of the heavens and the temper of the air.... But they were dim-sighted at the signs of times; that is, at those eminent signs which plainly pointed, as with the finger and by a visible mark, that now those times that were so much foretold and expected, even the days of the Messias, were at hand." Lightfoot (who cites instances of the carefulness of the Jews in observing the signs of the seasons).

5. *to the other side.*] It is clear from the narrative of St. Mark that a new voyage is here spoken of from the coasts of Magdala to the opposite side of the lake, which St. Matthew more briefly indicates by the words "he left them and departed."

6. *the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.*] St. Mark reports these words with a slight variation, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the leaven of Herod." In this connection the Herodian party seem to be identified with the Sadducees, which, as regards religious teaching, may well have been the case. The Herodians (of whom hardly anything is known except from the Gospels) seem to have been not a religious sect, but as their name indicates, supporters of the authority of the Herodian family (at this time

7 And they reasoned among themselves, saying, *It is* because we have taken no bread.

8 *Which* when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread?

[a ch. 14. 17.] 9 [a] Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up?

[b ch. 15. 34.] 10 [b] Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up?

11 How is it that ye do not understand that I spake *it* not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees?

12 Then understood they how that he bade *them* not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

13 ¶ When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, [c] Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? [c Mark 8. 27. Luke 9. 18]

---

of Herod Antipas, and probably of his father before him), and therefore not rigid observers of the Mosaic ordinances, but inclined to approve of that approximation of Judaism to heathen civilisation, of which the Herodian family were the chief representatives. Thus their leaven, or influence, though rather of a political than a religious, would in its tendency coincide with that of the Sadducees, the freethinkers of Judaism. The theory that the Herodians were a religious sect who regarded Herod the Great as the Messiah (see Pseudo-Tertullian, adv. omnes Hær. c. i.; Epiphan. Hær. xx.), probably arose from a mere conjecture suggested by the name; no such sect being mentioned by any trustworthy historical authority. On the relation of the Herodians to the Pharisees, see below on ch. xxii. 16.

**7.** *because we have taken no bread.*] The disciples seem to have understood our Lord's words as a caution concerning the kind of bread they were to purchase to satisfy their present need. The Pharisees laid down distinctions concerning the kind of leaven that might be used in making bread. (See Lightfoot on this passage.) The disciples interpreted our Lord's words as a caution against procuring bread from His enemies. Our Lord's reply, by reminding them of His recent miracles, implies that there was no need to advise them concerning the purchase of food, which His own power could supply, if it were needed. In the original of verses 9, 10 the same distinction is observed in the two words rendered *basket*, as in the narrative of the miracles. (See note on ch. xiv. 20.)

**12.** *the doctrine.*] The mention of doctrine under the image of leaven leavening as it were a lump (cf. Gal. v. 9) seems to imply such teaching as the human traditions, which by the Pharisees corrupted the word of God. There is no contradiction between rejecting these traditions and observing the commands of the Scribes and Pharisees when given in their official capacity as teachers of the law of Moses. (See ch. xxiii. 1.)

13-20. THE GREAT CONFESSION OF FAITH.

**13.** *When Jesus came.*] The confession of St. Peter is recorded by all the synoptic Evangelists, and with the same note of time, all placing it shortly before the transfiguration. The confession recorded by St. John (vi. 69) seems to belong to the same period of time, but the context seems to denote a different event, though some of the best of recent harmonists, such as Wieseler and Tischendorf identify the two (compare Ellicott, 'Lectures,' p. 212). The probability seems rather to be that the confession here recorded was first made (cf. verse 17), and that the Apostle shortly afterwards referred to this the acknowledged belief of himself and his brethren as their reason for abiding with their Master when others left Him.

*Cæsarea Philippi.*] This city was situated at the source of the eastern or longer branch of the Jordan, called the Great Jordan by Josephus ('B. J.' iv. 11), to distinguish it from the shorter branch or Little Jordan which was at Dan about four miles distant. The site of the city was originally called Panium, and the city itself Paneas, probably from having been dedicated to the worship of Pan, of which traces are still extant, though there is no historical record of any temple of Pan on the spot. (See Robinson, 'Later Bibl. Res.' p. 406.) Herod the Great dedicated a temple here to Augustus (Jos., 'Ant.,' xv. 10, § 3), and his son Philip, the Tetrarch, enlarged the city, and called it Cæsarea, in honour of the Emperor (Jos., 'Ant.,' xviii. 2, § 1; 'B. J.,' ii. 9, § 1). The name of the founder Philip was added to distinguish it from the better known Cæsarea on the sea

14 And they said, Some *say that thou art* John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets.

15 He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am?

16 And Simon Peter answered and said, [a]Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

[a] John 6. 69.

17 And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed *it* unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

18 And I say also unto thee, That [b]thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

[b] John 1. 42.

---

coast built by Herod the Great. The latter (Cæsarea Stratonis) is the Cæsarea of the Acts. The older name of Cæsarea Philippi still survives in its modern name Banias. There is no distinct mention of this city in the Old Testament, though some have identified it, not improbably, with Baal-Gad under Mount Hermon (Josh. xi. 17, xii. 7, xiii. 5).

*that I the Son of man am.*] On the meaning of the title *Son of Man*, see on ch. viii. 20. From our Lord's language it would seem that the people had accepted this name by which He commonly spoke of Himself, but either did not understand it in its proper Messianic sense, or held erroneous opinions concerning the person of the Messiah. (The two oldest MSS and most ancient versions read, "*that the Son of man is:*" but the received text is strongly supported. F. C. C.)

**14.** *John the Baptist.*] See on ch. xiv. 1.

*Elias.*] From a misapplication of the prophecy of Malachi iv. 5.

*Jeremias, or one of the prophets.*] Jeremiah was placed by the Rabbins first in the list of the prophetical books, which may account for his being here named as the leader, as it were, of the prophets. (See Lightfoot on Matt. xxvii. 9.) He was also the hero of sundry traditions in connection with the captivity and future fortunes of the people. (See 2 Macc. ii. 4-8, xv. 12-16.)

**16.** *the Son of the living God.*] (See note on ch. xiv. 33.) It is clear from our Lord's reply that this expression was not a customary one among the Jews of that day, or at least was used by St. Peter in a far higher sense than that which it conveyed in its ordinary acceptation. It amounts here to a distinct acknowledgement of the Divine Nature of Christ; a truth which, though implied in the Old Testament prophecies, was not generally accepted by the Jews (see above on ch. xiv. 33), and was made known to Peter, not by human interpretation of the Scriptures, but by divine revelation of their true meaning as realised in his Lord.

**17.** *Simon Bar-jona.*] *I. e.* Simon son of Jona. Our Lord here addresses Peter by his original name and patronymic, as again John xvi. 15-17, and earlier on first giving him the name of Peter or Cephas, John i. 43. The attempts of some commentators to find an allegorical meaning, *son of a dove*, *i.e.* child of the Spirit (Hieron. in Evang. Matt. iii. c. 16, Olshausen, &c.), seem far fetched and out of place.

*flesh and blood.*] *I. e.* man (cf. Ecclus. xiv. 18). In the same sense and with the same contrast between divine revelation and human teaching, St. Paul says, "I conferred not with flesh and blood" (Gal. i. 16).

**18.** *thou art Peter.*] *I. e.* thou art that which thy name implies, a rock. The name has been given before (see John i. 42). Peter's present conduct shewed its appropriateness. The usual meaning of the masculine form πέτρος is a stone, as distinguished from πέτρα a rock; though πέτρος is said to be occasionally found in the latter signification in classical Greek (*e.g.* Soph. Phil. 272, but this and the other examples cited are doubtful). The distinction, however, cannot be pressed in this passage, as the masculine form would naturally be adopted in the proper name, even if applied in the sense in which the appellative is usually feminine: "πέτρος," says Bengel, "alias denotat *lapidem*, sed in Simone *petram*."

*and upon this rock.*] The verbal allusion is lost in our translation, but the Greek (σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ) can hardly be naturally interpreted except as referring to the person of Peter, and the fulfilment of the prediction is to be found in the fact that St. Peter was the chosen agent in laying the foundation of the Christian Church, both among the Jews (Acts ii. 41) and among the Gentiles (Acts x. 44-48, cf. Acts xv. 7). But the promise is given to St. Peter individually, as the person who by divine revelation had uttered his confession. Nothing is said or intimated concerning any office that Peter was afterwards to hold, nor of any successor in such an office. With Bengel, who adopts the above interpretation, we may fairly say *Quid hæc ad Romam?*

c John 20. 23.

19 [c]And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

---

The personal allusion to St. Peter cannot be set aside by distinguishing between πέτρος and πέτρα (see the last note). The masculine form, πέτρος, in the sense of a *rock* is so rare that it could hardly have been used in this place, either by our Lord if He spoke in Greek, or by the translator of His words, if He spoke in Aramaic. There is therefore no force in the objection that, had St. Peter been personally referred to, the Evangelist would have written ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πέτρῳ.

The two other principal expositions of this passage are, (1) That which interprets the rock as meaning the faith confessed by St. Peter; (2) That which interprets it of our Lord himself—"upon the rock," *i. e.* upon myself. Neither of these interpretations is open to the charge of being suggested by the exigencies of controversy, for both are found in the early Fathers: the first in Hilary, De Trin. vi. 35; Greg. Nyss. c. Jud. *ad fin.*; Chrysostom, Hom. liv. in Matt. § 2; the second in Augustine's Serm. lxxvi. 1, cccxx. § 2. But though sanctioned by these authorities, they can hardly be regarded as natural interpretations, missing as they do the verbal allusion to Peter's name.

*my church.*] This is the earliest use of the word ἐκκλησία to denote the Church of Christ, the whole "congregation of faithful men." In the LXX and the apocryphal books the word is frequently employed in a similar sense, sometimes to denote the whole people of Israel as the chosen of God, sometimes for a special assembly collected on a given occasion. In the former sense, which most nearly corresponds to the general conception of the Christian Church, St. Stephen (Acts vii. 38) speaks of the "church in the wilderness."

*the gates of hell.*] More correctly "the gates of Hades." Our translation suggests the idea of a conflict between the Church of Christ and the power of Satan, which is not implied in the original. Hades is the invisible world, the kingdom of death, the region of departed human souls; not the place of torment, the abode of evil spirits; and the idea of an active conflict on the part of Satan is inconsistent with the passive image of the *gates* of Hades, and, with the use of the same expression in the Old Testament, where it means the abode of the dead, regarded as a prison or a place of secrecy. (See *e.g.* Isai. xxxviii. 10; LXX Wisd. xvi. 13, where the Greek has πύλαι ᾅδου, as here; Job xxxviii. 17; Ps. ix. 13, where the equivalent expression πύλαι θανάτου is used.) The meaning rather is, that the prison of the dead shall have no power to retain the members of Christ's Church, who, by His redemption, shall be rescued from it, and be united with Him in His heavenly kingdom. The idea is the same as in 1 Cor. xv. 54-57. The exclusion of the idea of an active struggle of Satan against the Church, carries with it the exclusion of that of a conflict between true and false teaching. Hence it is an entire perversion to interpret the words as implying a promise of infallibility to the Church of St. Peter. (The interpretation here adopted is supported by the latest commentators, Weiss, and Lutteroth. F. C. C.)

19. *the keys of the kingdom of heaven.*] The expression *the kingdom of heaven* has been already explained as meaning the Church of Christ. (See on ch. 2, 3, xiii. 3.) By the *keys* of the kingdom will therefore naturally be meant the power of admitting to or excluding from the communion of the Church. Here again, as in the figure of the rock, an office is in a secondary sense assigned to Peter, which primarily belongs to Christ. (See Rev. iii. 7.) The expression is taken from Isai. xxii. 22, where Eliakim is entrusted with a similar power of admitting to, or excluding from, the royal palace. It may be doubted whether there is any allusion to the key given to a Scribe on admission to his office. (See on ch. vii. 29.)

*and whatsoever thou shalt bind, &c.*] The same thought is here further expanded. The terms to *bind* and to *loose* in the Hebrew idiom signify to *forbid*, and to *allow*, of which use abundant instances are collected by Lightfoot. The meaning therefore is, that St. Peter, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, should be empowered to enact the rules to be observed as conditions of admission to the Christian Church, and that these laws should have the sanction of Divine authority, being ratified by God as well as by man.

The same promise was afterwards given to all the Apostles (ch. xviii. 18), but there are special instances of its fulfilment in the case of St. Peter. He excluded from the kingdom of heaven, when he said to Simon Magus, "thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter" (Acts viii. 2). He admitted men uncircumcised into the Church, in the persons of Cornelius and his companions (Acts x. 47).

The meaning of this passage is distinct from that of John xx. 23, though the term *to loose* is sometimes used for forgiving sins (see Isai.

20 Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.

21 ¶ From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day.

22 Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee.

23 But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.

24 ¶ [d] Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any *man* will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

[d] ch. 10. 38. Mark 8. 34.

---

xl. 2; LXX; Ecclus. xxviii. 2), there is no authority for using *to bind* in the sense of *to retain*. And even if the figure be allowed (which may perhaps be defended by the cognate use of καταδέω in the sense of *condemn* or convict, cf. Herod. ii. 174, iv. 68), the expression *whatsoever* is far too general to admit of this interpretation. Such a meaning would rather require the expression *whomsoever* thou shalt bind, &c., *i.e.* whomsoever thou shalt condemn or absolve.

**20.** *that he was Jesus the Christ.*] We should probably read "that he was the Christ." MS authority is divided as regards the insertion of the name *Jesus*, but internal probability is against it. (The oldest MSS and early Fathers omit it, see Tisch. ed. 8. F. C. C.)

21–28. ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEATH.

**21.** *From that time forth, &c.*] We are now in the last year of our Lord's ministry, which extended from the Passover immediately following the feeding of the five thousand (John vi. 4) to the Passover at which He was crucified. This year is divided into two nearly equal parts by the Feast of Tabernacles recorded by St. John vii. 2. The first half may again be divided into two parts of uncertain length, the former embracing the events in Galilee and its vicinity down to the time of St. Peter's confession (ch. xiv. 13 to xvi. 20), the latter extending from the confession to the Feast of Tabernacles. We may thus specify a period which may be estimated roughly at about three-quarters of a year, during which our Lord gradually prepared His disciples for His approaching sufferings and death.

*the elders and chief priests and scribes.*] See on ch. ii. 4.

*and be raised again.*] From Mark ix. 10, 32, it is evident that the disciples at that time did not understand the promise of their Master's resurrection literally. Probably they could not reconcile the literal interpretation with their Jewish view of the Messiah. How they did understand it may be matter for many conjectures, but for no certainty; and therefore need not be curiously examined. The fact, however, that in some way or other they did misunderstand it, is a sufficient answer to the cavil which some modern critics, such as Reimarus ('Wolfenb. Fragm.'), Paulus, Strauss, and even Neander and Meyer, have raised against the truth of the narrative in the text; namely, that had so clear a prediction been given, the disciples could not have been slow to believe in their Lord's resurrection when it took place. These sorts of criticisms in the potential mood, concerning what men might, should, or ought to have done under certain circumstances, are unsafe in proportion to the remoteness of the critic from the time of the events, and his want of acquaintance with the persons and circumstances. Yet conjectures of this kind are frequently preferred to the most positive testimony as regards the facts themselves.

**23.** *Get thee behind me, Satan.*] Cf. ch. iv. 10. There is no reason to interpret the word Satan differently in this passage and in the former. The same rebuke which our Lord before addressed to the Tempter himself, He now addresses to Peter as doing the Tempter's work. The force of the expression is lost by those expositors (*e.g.* Maldonatus) who interpret the term simply in the general sense of *adversary*.

*an offence.*] Literally a "stumbling-block" (σκάνδαλον); probably still with an allusion to the meaning of Peter's name, no longer the rock of the Church, but the rock of offence. We can hardly doubt that there is a remembrance of these words of his Lord, when St. Peter himself, in the language of Isaiah, speaks of Christ as *a rock of offence* (πέτρα σκανδάλου) to the disobedient (1 Pet. ii. 8).

**24.** *unto his disciples.*] Not to the disciples alone, but to the disciples, together with the people. (See Mark viii. 34.)

*take up his cross.*] See on ch. x. 38.

25 For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it.

26 For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

27 For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; [e]and then he shall reward every man according to his works.

[e] Ps. 62. 12. Rom. 2. 6.

28 Verily I say unto you, [f]There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.

[f] Mark 9. 1. Luke 9. 27.

## CHAPTER XVII.

1 *The transfiguration of Christ.* 14 *He healeth the lunatick,* 22 *foretelleth his own passion,* 24 *and payeth tribute.*

AND [g]after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his

[g] Mark 9. 2. Luke 9. 28.

---

**27.** *For the Son of man shall come, &c.*] The principal import of these words no doubt relates to the future coming of Christ to judge the world. There is probably a secondary reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, both as in itself a judgment on those who had rejected Him, and also as typical of the final judgment of the world; but this reference is not so clearly expressed here as in the parallel prophecy in ch. xxiv.

**28.** *Verily I say unto you, &c.*] Before this verse, both St. Mark and St. Luke insert words similar in substance, though not in expression, to those recorded earlier by St. Matthew, ch. x. 33. The parallel between this latter passage and Luke xii. 9 sufficiently shows that the words there recorded were spoken on a different occasion from the present, and that St. Matthew in the present place differs from the other two Evangelists only in reporting our Lord's words in a somewhat abbreviated form.

*coming in his kingdom.*] Our Lord does not say *coming to judgment*, but *coming in his kingdom.* The last judgment is not the commencement, but the termination of that mediatorial kingdom of Christ, which He has, as the Son of man, and in which He is the Head of the Church and the ruler over quick and dead. (See John v. 27; Rom. xiv. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25; and compare Hooker, E. P., v. 55-8; and Pearson on the Creed, Art. VI.) The mention of the last judgment naturally suggests that of the kingdom of which that judgment is the consummation; and our Lord proceeds to declare that some of those then present should live to see the foundation of a Church which should acknowledge Him as its King, and over which He would reign till the end of the world.

The above seems the natural meaning of the *kingdom* of the Son of man, if we compare John xviii. 36, and the similar use of the expression the "kingdom of heaven" in the present gospel. (See on ch. iii. 2, xiii. 3.) But when we compare ch. xxiv. 34, and John xxi. 22, it is hardly possible to exclude an implied reference to the coming of Christ in judgment at the destruction of Jerusalem. This event may indeed in one sense be regarded as the commencement of that kingdom of which the last judgment is the completion; for the utter destruction of the Jewish temple and nation proclaimed to all the world that no other Messiah could be expected than He who had already come.

Many expositors (*e.g.* some mentioned by Origen on this place, Hilary, and Jerome, *ibid.*) refer this verse to the Transfiguration, in which case the promise relates only to the three Apostles, Peter, James, and John. This interpretation, however, seems open to objection: (1) because it does not satisfy the usual meaning of *the kingdom* in the Gospels; and (2) because our Lord's words seem naturally to point to a more remote event.

### CHAP. XVII.—1-13. THE TRANSFIGURATION.

**1.** *after six days.*] So also St. Mark. St. Luke says "about an eight days (ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ) after these sayings." The indefinite ὡσεὶ shews that St. Luke does not profess to give the exact interval; but the two reckonings may be identified if we suppose the one to be exclusive, the other inclusive, of the days on which the two events occurred. Compare the expression "after eight days," John xx. 26, which seems there to mean the interval from one Lord's day to another.

*Peter, James, and John.*] These three had been selected before as witnesses of the raising of the daughter of Jairus, and afterwards were chosen to accompany their Master in His agony in Gethsemane. St. Peter himself testifies to his presence at the Transfiguration (2 Pet. i. 18), and St. John, though he does not relate the event in his gospel, apparently alludes to it (John i. 14).

brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart,

2 And was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light.

3 And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him.

4 Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias.

5 [k]While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.

[k] 2 Pet. 1. 17.

6 And when the disciples heard *it*, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid.

7 And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid.

8 And when they had lifted up their eyes, they saw no man, save Jesus only.

---

*into an high mountain.*] Tradition, though not of very early origin, identifies this mountain with Tabor; but this seems improbable, as the top of Tabor was apparently at that time the seat of a fortress. (See on this point, Robinson, 'Researches,' vol. iii. p. 222; Ritter, 'Geogr. of Palestine,' vol. ii. p. 312, Eng. Tr.) From Mark ix. 30 we may perhaps infer that our Lord was still in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi, and that the scene of the Transfiguration was one of the mountains of that region,—perhaps Hermon (Stanley, 'Sinai and Palestine,' p. 399), or Panium (Thomson, 'Land and Book,' p. 231). (See note on Mark ix. 2. F. C. C.)

2. *And was transfigured.*] It is impossible on any fair interpretation of the narrative, to regard the Transfiguration otherwise than as a real and a supernatural occurrence. The hypothesis of a mythical story, framed after the model of the glorification of Moses on his descent from Sinai (Strauss), is excluded by the precise point of time assigned to the event, both in relation to the preceding circumstances (verse 1) and to the following (Luke ix. 37), as well as by the command to the three disciples (verses 9, 10). The hypothesis of a dream or a vision (Kuinöl, Herder, Neander) is excluded by the fact of its having been seen by three different persons; and that of a natural occurrence (Paulus, who supposes a mist illuminated by the rising sun, and two unknown persons mistaken for Moses and Elias) breaks down by its own clumsiness. By admitting the event to be not only real, but supernatural, we avoid the difficulties raised by those who curiously inquire how Moses and Elias can have appeared, whether in their natural bodies or otherwise, and how they again disappeared in the cloud (Meyer, who needlessly attempts to make the transfiguration itself real, but the appearance of Moses and Elias a vision). God's power is surely sufficient to accomplish the fact; the supernatural exercise of that power renders it useless to investigate the manner of its accomplishment.

3. *talking with him.*] St. Luke adds that they "spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem." The same Evangelist adds some other particulars not mentioned by St. Matthew or St. Mark, as that our Lord went up into a mountain to pray, that the three disciples were heavy with sleep, but nevertheless remained awake (not "when they were awake," as in the Authorised Version). These circumstances render it probable that the Transfiguration took place during the night.

4. *let us make here three tabernacles.*] Continuing the thought, "it is good for us to be here." St. Peter seems to have desired to make the tabernacles as abiding places wherein his Master, with Moses and Elias, might prolong His dwelling on the mountain, and perhaps avoid the suffering which awaited Him at Jerusalem. The strangeness of the request is explained by St. Mark and St. Luke, both of whom add that Peter knew not what he said. (See note on Mark ix. 6. F. C. C.)

5. *overshadowed them.*] *I.e.* our Lord, Moses, and Elias. The disciples were not overshadowed; they heard the voice out of the cloud.

*hear ye him.*] These words and the disappearance of the heavenly messengers are symbolically connected, as signifying that God, who had spoken in times past to the fathers by the prophets, henceforth would speak by His Son. (Alford.) They also indicate our Lord as completely fulfilling the prophecy of Moses (Deut. xviii. 15-19), which was partially fulfilled in Joshua. The remembrance of this voice may have been present to the mind of St. Peter when he cites

9 And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead.

10 And his disciples asked him, saying, [i] Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come?

[i] ch. 11. 14. Mark 9. 11.

11 And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things.

12 But I say unto you, That Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them.

13 Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist.

14 ¶ [k] And when they were come to the multitude, there came to him a *certain* man, kneeling down to him, and saying,

[k] Mark 9. 17. Luke 9. 38.

15 Lord, have mercy on my son: for he is lunatick, and sore vexed: for ofttimes he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water.

16 And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him.

17 Then Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how

---

the above prophecy and applies it to Christ (Acts iii. 22).

9. *the vision.*] Literally, "the thing seen," equivalent to the expression in St. Mark, "what things they had seen" (ἃ εἶδον). The word does not imply any unreality.

10. *Why then say the scribes.*] The word *then* clearly implies an inference from the preceding command—"If we are to keep the vision secret, what is the meaning of the doctrine that the coming of Elias must precede the manifestation of the Messiah? Is not this which we have seen the coming of Elias, and should it not be proclaimed as a sign that the Messiah's kingdom is at hand?" This question is a clear sign of the historical character of the narrative. Had the witness of the three disciples been invented in support of a mythical story it is hardly possible that this incident could have found a place in it, or the traditions with which Malachi's prophecy of the coming of Elijah were overlaid by the Jewish teachers. (See Lightfoot on this passage.)

11. *Elias truly shall first come.*] In the original "cometh," though in a future sense. *I.e.* the prophecy is true which says that Elias shall first come, but it is already fulfilled. The present taken in a future sense is only used as referring back to the original form of the prophecy. The attempt to interpret these words as implying a prediction of a future advent of Elijah in person seems forced and unnecessary, though adopted by high authorities, especially among the Fathers. (See Origen and Chrysostom on Matt. xvii., Hilary, c. xx. in St. Matt., S. Aug. 'de Civ. Dei,' xx. 29, and in Joh. Tract. iv., quoted by Bp. Wordsworth *in loc.* F. C. C.)

*and restore all things.*] Abbreviated from the LXX version of Mal. iv. 6, which renders "who shall restore (ἀποκαταστήσει as here) the heart of the father to the son and the heart of a man towards his neighbour." This text may possibly have given rise to the representation of the coming of Elias as a restorer of all things. The later Rabbis looked forward to this event as a restitution of the earlier glories of their Temple and religion, especially of the holy things (see Lightfoot on this place), and such may have been the interpretation of the Scribes at this time. Our Lord shews that its true meaning is the repentance preached by John as a preparation for His own coming.

### 14-21. Cure of Lunatic Child.

14. *And when they were come to the multitude.*] All the three Synoptists agree in placing the cure of this demoniac immediately after the transfiguration; an agreement which is in itself an evidence of the historical character of the transfiguration itself. St. Luke shows his independence by stating more particularly that the cure took place on the day after the transfiguration. If, as is probable, the transfiguration took place in the night (see on verse 3), our Lord and His disciples would naturally come down from the mountain on the following morning.

15. *lunatick.*] See on ch. iv. 24. The symptoms appear to have been those of epilepsy, accompanied by suspension of speech (Mark ix. 17, 18), caused in this case by demoniacal possession, but not confounded with it.

17. *O faithless and perverse generation.*] The expression, *perverse generation* (γενεὰ διεστραμμένη) occurs in the LXX version of the words of Moses, concerning the people of Israel (Deut. xxxii. 5). Similar language

long shall I suffer you? bring him hither to me.

18 And Jesus rebuked the devil; and he departed out of him: and the child was cured from that very hour.

19 Then came the disciples to Jesus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out?

20 And Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief: for verily I say unto you, [l]If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.

[l] Luke 17. 6.

21 Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.

22 ¶ [m]And while they abode in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men:

[m] ch. 20. 17. Mark 9. 31. Luke 9. 44.

23 And they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised again. And they were exceeding sorry.

24 ¶ And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received [1]tribute *money* came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute?

[1] Called in the original *didrachma*, being in value fifteen pence.

---

is used by our Lord of the Scribes and Pharisees (ch. xii. 39), and of the Pharisees and Sadducees (ch. xvi. 4). These passages make it improbable that this rebuke is here addressed especially to the disciples, as some interpret. In St. Mark's account (ix. 14) we read that the Scribes were questioning with the people, and we may naturally suppose that the tendency of their questions was to throw discredit on our Lord on account of the failure of His disciples. It is probable, therefore, that our Lord's words are principally addressed to the Scribes and those who were influenced by them. Whether the disciples are also included seems doubtful, though a partial parallel may be found in the language of our Lord to Philip (John xiv. 9). The disciples are separately rebuked for their want of faith at verse 20.

**18.** *And Jesus rebuked the devil.*] The graphic description of St. Mark (ix. 20-27) adds many particulars which shew an independent source of information.

**20.** *as a grain of mustard seed.*] *I. e.* the smallest faith. (See ch. xiii. 32.)

*ye shall say unto this mountain.*] The all-sufficing power of faith seems to have been proverbially expressed among the Jews by the saying that it can remove mountains. (See 1 Cor. xiii. 2, and Lightfoot on Matt. xxi. 21.) Our Lord gives a vivid expression to the proverb by pointing to the mountain now before them, as He did again on a subsequent occasion (ch. xxi. 21).

**21.** *this kind.*] *I. e.* this kind of evil spirit. To faith indeed nothing is impossible; but the faith which is to work such miracles as the casting out of these evil spirits must itself be formed by prayer and fasting. Some interpret prayer and fasting on the part of the sufferer, which seems less natural. (On the reading see note on Mark ix. 29. F. C. C.)

**22.** *The Son of man shall be betrayed.*] There was good reason for this repetition of what had been said before (ch. xvi. 16). The unbelief of Peter shewed how necessary it was that the disciples should be repeatedly taught the same truth.

24-27. TRIBUTE MONEY.

**24.** *tribute money.*] This incident is peculiar to St. Matthew. The word here used for tribute (δίδραχμον) is different from that used ch. xxii. 17 for the tribute paid to the Roman emperor. In the latter passage the Latin word census is used in its Greek form (κῆνσος). This alone would seem to imply that the tribute here spoken of was different from the other, and this suspicion is confirmed when we remember that the half-shekel paid by every Israelite above twenty years of age for the service of the temple (Exod. xxx. 13, xxxviii. 26. Cf. Josephus, 'Ant.,' xviii. 9, § 1; 'B. J.,' vii. 6, § 6), was equivalent in value to two Attic drachmas, probably at this time equivalent to about 1*s.* 6*d.* of our money. (See Josephus, 'Ant.,' iii. 8, § 2. Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær., § 38.) This tribute, which at first seems only to have been collected on the occasions of numbering the people, appears in later times to have become annual. (See 2 Chron. xxiv. 5; Nehem. x. 32, where a reduction appears to have been temporarily made in the amount on account of the poverty of the people; Philo de Monarch. ii. § 3; Josephus, 'Ant.,' xviii. 9, § 1. Cf. Trench on the Miracles, No. 28.) It was collected at the end of the ecclesiastical year in the latter part of the month Adar, the early part of our March.

The time of collection presents a difficulty in relation to the present passage, as the event here narrated seems to have taken place in the summer or autumn, not long before our Lord's journey to Jerusalem at the feast of

25 He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers?

26 Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free.

27 Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take,

¶ Or, *a stater.* It is half an ounce of silver, in value two and sixpence, after five shillings the ounce.

---

Tabernacles (John vii. 10). On account of this difficulty Wieseler ('Chr. Syn.,' p. 270) has revived the view of some earlier commentators, that the tribute here mentioned is the Roman census, which was collected in the month Elul or September. But the difficulties involved in this view are so great that it seems simpler to suppose that, in this instance the temple tribute was demanded at a different time. Such a view is perhaps supported by the Rabbinical authorities cited by Greswell ('Diss.,' vol. ii. p. 378), according to whom the half-shekel might, in different localities, be paid at any of the three great feasts. And, even without this testimony, it is almost certain that the payment must occasionally have been made at unusual times, and the present might very well have been an instance of the kind.

There is no evidence of our Lord having visited Capernaum (His "own city," ch. ix. 1) since the day after the feeding of the five thousand (John vi. 22-24), which appears to have been a brief visit shortly after the time at which the tribute was due. If not demanded on that occasion, it was natural that it would be asked for on His next return to the city. For the two interpretations and the authorities by which each is supported, see Archbishop Trench on this miracle.

**25.** *He saith, Yes.*] The remarks of Archbishop Trench on these words are well worthy of notice as showing the true import of the miracle which follows: "Peter at once replies in the affirmative. Zealous for his Lord's honour, and confident that His piety would make Him prompt in whatever God's ordinance required, he pledges Him without hesitation to the payment. Yet was he over-hasty in this. There was on his part a failing here to recognise the higher dignity of his Lord . . . For the time at least he had lost sight of His Lord's true position and prerogative, that He was a Son over His own house, and not a servant in another's; the Head of the theocracy, not one of its subordinate members —so that it was *to* Him in His Father that offerings were to be made, not *from* Him to be received. . . . It is for the purpose of bringing back Peter, and with him the other disciples, to the true recognition of Himself, from which they had in part fallen, that the Lord puts to him the question which follows. And for the same reason, being engaged, through Peter's hasty imprudence, to the rendering of the didrachn, which now He could scarcely recede from, He yet does it in the remarkable way of this present miracle—a miracle which should testify that all things served Him, from the greatest to the least, even to the fishes that walked through the paths of the sea—that He was Lord over nature, and, having nothing, yet in His Father's care for Him, was truly possessed of all things."

**26.** *Then are the children free.*] The argument is very clear on the supposition that the tribute was for the service of the Temple. "If the children of earthly kings are exempt from the tribute paid for their service, I, the Son of God, am in like manner free from the tribute raised for God's service." The half-shekel paid for the Temple was regarded as given to God. (See Josephus, 'Ant.,' xviii. 9, § 1.) Wieseler objects to this explanation that it does not apply to Peter, but only to Jesus. But it is nowhere said that any exemption was claimed for Peter. Our Lord's words to him merely assert that the money which was to be found in the mouth of the fish would suffice for both Himself and Peter, without in any way implying that Peter could claim exemption. Wieseler's own explanation is of itself sufficient to refute the hypothesis which requires it. He supposes that our Lord claims exemption, for Himself and Peter, from the tribute due to the Roman Emperor, on the plea that "the God-fearing and God-taught man is the rightful king of the earth." Even if this verbal evasion could be tolerated, the interpretation would still fail, for the argument claims exemption for the children of the king to whom the tribute is due, not for other kings, whether literally or figuratively such.

**27.** *a piece of money.*] In the original, "*a stater.*" The silver stater was equal to four drachmæ, or about 3*s.* English. The money was thus sufficient to pay the tribute for two persons. "It is observable," says Mr. R. S. Poole, "in confirmation of the minute accu-

and give unto them for me and thee.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

1 *Christ warneth his disciples to be humble and harmless:* 7 *to avoid offences, and not to despise the little ones:* 15 *teacheth how we are to deal with our brethren, when they offend us:* 21 *and how oft to forgive them.* 23 *which he setteth forth by a parable of the king, that took account of his servants,* 32 *and punished him, who shewed no mercy to his fellow.*

AT [a]the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?

[a] Mark 9. 33. Luke 9. 46.

2 And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them,

3 And said, Verily I say unto you, [b]Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.

[b] ch. 19. 14. 1 Cor. 14. 20.

---

racy of this Evangelist, that at this period the silver currency of Palestine consisted of Greek imperial tetradrachms, or staters, and Roman denarii of a quarter their value, didrachms having fallen into disuse. Had two didrachms been found by St. Peter, the receivers of tribute would hardly have taken them, and no doubt the ordinary coin paid was that miraculously supplied." (Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' Art. *Stater.*)

The true import of this miracle has been shewn in the note on verse 25. It must not be regarded as differing from the rest of our Lord's miracles in being a mere expedient to supply a temporal need. It was rather a miraculous evidence to convince the disciples of His divine power even while He submitted as man to the ordinances of the law, and in this point of view it has been compared by Archbishop Trench to the voice from heaven which accompanied His baptism. It is hardly necessary elaborately to refute the natural or the mythical attempts to explain away the miracle; they sufficiently refute themselves. Paulus supposes that Peter is to open the fish's mouth to take out the hook, and then to sell it for a stater—a meaning which the original words cannot possibly bear. Strauss contents himself with cavilling at the physical difficulties of the miracle, and supposing that the narrative may have arisen from the much-used theme of a catching of fish by Peter on the one side, and on the other from the well-known stories of precious things having been found in the bodies of fish. The miracle indeed must appear capricious and unnecessary to those who regard our Lord merely as a man. It is only when we see in His assertion of His Sonship a direct claim to the Divine nature that the miracle finds an appropriate place as an immediate manifestation of the Divine power over nature which His claim carries with it.

### Chap. XVIII.—1-20. The Last Warnings at Capernaum.

1. *At the same time.*] *I.e.* during the same visit to Capernaum as that recorded in the last chapter. In this note of time all the Synoptists agree, and St. Mark expressly adds that the incident took place at Capernaum in the house. The previous dispute by the way might naturally have arisen from the apparent pre-eminence given to Peter, James, and John at the Transfiguration.

*Who is the greatest.*] In the original, "who then is greatest" (τίς ἄρα μείζων). The particle of inference, omitted in our version, seems to imply a reference to something omitted by the Evangelist. It has clearly no connection with the conclusion of the last chapter. The narrative of St. Mark supplies the omission. If we suppose the question of the disciples in this place to come between verses 35 and 36 of Mark ix., the two narratives will supplement each other, and the apparent discrepancy between St. Matthew's account, which represents our Lord as replying to the spoken question of the disciples, and St. Mark's, which represents Him as replying to their unspoken thought, will disappear.

2. *a little child.*] A tradition, which however cannot be traced higher than the latter part of the 9th century, identifies the child with St. Ignatius; but this tradition probably arose from a misinterpretation, in a passive sense, of the epithet θεοφόρος, used by Ignatius in the addresses of his Epistles, and interpreted in the genuine account of his martyrdom in an active sense, as meaning "he that has Christ in his heart." On this point see Pearson, 'Vind. Ign.,' p. 527, ed. Churton. (Zahn shews that Θεοφόρος is a proper name, cf. Patt. Apost. ed. G. et Z. 1876. F. C. C.)

3. *Verily I say unto you, &c.*] The contents of verses 3 and 4 are omitted in the abridged narrative of St. Mark and St. Luke. That they belong to this place is manifest from their relation to the question asked in verse 1. It will be observed that our Lord does not satisfy the personal ambition of the disciples by designating an individual who shall be greatest in the kingdom of heaven,

4 Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.

5 And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me.

6 [a] But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and *that* he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

[a] Mark 9. 42. Luke 17. 1, 2.

7 ¶ Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh!

8 [b] Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast *them* from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.

[b] ch. 5. 30. Mark 9. 45.

9 And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee:

---

but points out the frame of mind which all should strive to attain without thereby excluding another.

*the kingdom of heaven.*] This expression here retains its usual meaning of the Church of Christ; but, by way of contrast to the carnal views entertained by the Apostles, it is limited to the true members of that Church: those who are followers of Christ in spirit, and not merely in name. The expression "shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" is thus equivalent to "cannot be my disciples," Luke xiv. 26.

**4.** *shall humble himself.*] The humility of the child, who naturally looks up to his elders, is contrasted with the self-exalting spirit of those who desired to be above their fellows in the kingdom of heaven.

**5.** *one such little child.*] *I.e.* any one having the humble disposition of a child, whether actually a child in age or not. (Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 20.)

*in my name.*] *I. e.* because he bears my name, because he is my disciple (cf. on ch. x. 42). The humblest of those who bear Christ's name are His brethren, and to receive them is to receive Him. (Cf. ch. xxv. 40.)

**6.** *shall offend.*] *I. e.* shall cause to stumble, used with especial reference to such acts as turn away any one from belief in Christ, as opposed to *receiving*, *i.e.* confirming him in the faith. In St. Mark these words are preceded by the confession of John, that the disciples had forbidden one from casting out devils in the name of Jesus, because he followed not them; and St. Luke gives this account in the same context, though without the following remarks. This confession might naturally have been prompted by the language of verse 5 (Mark ix. 37), though it is omitted by St. Matthew, who gives our Lord's own words in a continuous form.

*a millstone.*] In the original, "an ass-millstone," *i. e.* the stone of the large mill turned by an ass, as distinguished from the smaller mills turned by hand.

**7.** *it must needs be that offences come, &c.*] So long as the world lasts, sins and occasions of sin will exist, but this fact does not destroy the personal responsibility of each individual for his own sin. The existence of sin in the mass, even though the average amount of every crime may be estimated by statistics, does not in the least clash with the fact that each man is a free agent, and is responsible as such for his actions. The kind of law, if it may be so called, which is established by statistical calculations, is of a totally different kind from those natural laws which indicate an unvarying sequence of cause and effect. The latter are indications generalised into laws from being observed to be valid in individual cases. The former are merely statements of general uniformity observed in masses only, and not in individuals, the individual variations being compensated and lost sight of, owing to the large scale on which the calculation is made. The so-called philosophy of the present day, which would annihilate the free will of man, is opposed to the natural consciousness of man, no less than to Divine revelation.

**8.** *Wherefore if thy hand, &c.*] "Wherefore" is not in the original, which merely says, "and if thy hand," &c. (Cf. Mark ix. 43.) This verse is not an inference from the preceding, but a transition to another branch of the subject—from the doom denounced on him who causes offences on the one side, to the duty on the other of avoiding whatever causes offence to ourselves. The injunction is repeated in substance from ch. v. 29, 30, but is such as might naturally be used on both occasions. This and the following verse are given by St. Mark in a more expanded form, which is probably that in which they were originally spoken. The two, however, only differ as a full and an abridged report of the same saying.

*everlasting fire.*] τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον. The

it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire.

10 Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.

11 [c]For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.

12 [d]How think ye? if a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray?

[c] Luke 19. 10.
[d] Luke 15. 4.

---

word *αἰώνιος* is sometimes rendered by our translators *eternal*, and sometimes *everlasting*. Looking to the derivation of the words, the former rendering (*æternus*, *æviternus*) would be the more exact equivalent of *αἰώνιος*, and the latter (*sempiternus*, *semper*) of the cognate term *ἀΐδιος*, which is more common in classical Greek, and occurs occasionally in the New Testament (Rom. i. 20; Jude 6). With reference to actual use, however, it is impossible to express by one English word the different shades of meaning of *αἰώνιος*, which can only be explained by the corresponding meanings of the substantive *αἰών*. This word in its primary sense means an entire duration as distinguished from a limited portion of such duration. (Cf. Aristotle, 'De Cælo,' i. 9, *τὸ γὰρ τελος τὸ περιέχον τὸν τῆς ἑκάστου ζωῆς χρόνον, οὗ μηθὲν ἔξω κατὰ φύσιν, αἰὼν ἑκάστου κέκληται.* Hence it is applied: 1. To the life of an individual or of a generation (Hom. Il. iv. 478, Æsch. Sep. Ant. Theb. 774; thus Hesych., *ὁ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνος*). 2. (later) To a dispensation or state of things universally, *e.g.* the present world (Matt. xii. 32, xiii. 39), or other dispensations past or future (1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. iii. 9, 11; Heb. i. 2; Rom. i. 25; Eph. ii. 7). 3. Especially to eternity as distinguished from time (John vi. 51; 2 Pet. iii. 18. Cf. Plato 'Tim.,' p. 37, Philo, De Mut. Nom., § 47). Hence the corresponding meanings of the adjective *αἰώνιος*: 1. Perpetual, lasting for life, or for the whole existence of the object spoken of (Philem. 5. Cf. Deut. xv. 17, where the LXX have *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* for Hebrew עוֹלָם). 2. Belonging to an entire dispensation, *e.g.* in all past time (Rom. xvi. 25). 3. Especially belonging to the entire future dispensation, and hence, by inference, everlasting, because that dispensation will have no end (as in the present passage). In this sense *αἰώνιος* is opposed to *πρόσκαιρος* (2 Cor. iv. 18). In this sense *αἰὼν* and *αἰώνιος* are the usual renderings by the LXX of the Hebrew עוֹלָם. The metaphysical discussion as to the distinction between time and eternity, whether the latter is to be regarded, with Aristotle (Phys. viii. 1), as duration without limit, or with Plato (Prim., pp. 37, 38), and many Christian writers after him, as a mode of existence out of all duration and succession, is a question insoluble by us, and irrelevant to passages like the present, which speaks not of the absolute nature of God, but of finite existence which cannot be dissociated from duration and succession. (See note on Mark ix. 43. F. C. C.)

10. *their angels do always behold, &c.*] *I.e.* children are under the care of the highest order of angels, of those that stand continually in the presence of God. (Cf. Luke i. 19, and for the origin of the expression 1 Kings x. 8.) The natural meaning of these words undoubtedly implies the existence of guardian angels appointed to watch over these little ones. (Compare Ps. xxxiv. 7, xci. 11; Heb. i. 14.)

11. *For the Son of man, &c.*] This verse is omitted in some early MSS and versions; but can hardly have been interpolated from Luke xix. 10, in which case the words, "to seek," so appropriate to the present context, would not have been omitted. Assuming it to be genuine in this place, its omission may be accounted for by its apparent want of connection with the concluding words of the preceding verse. The connection, however, is with the former part of the verse; the thought being, "Take heed lest ye despise one of these little ones, and think lightly of causing them to offend; for in causing the loss even of one of the least of your brethren, ye destroy one whom Christ came to save."

12. *If a man have, &c.*] The same thought is further pursued in the parable. "Think not lightly of causing one of these little ones to fall; for they are precious in the sight of God, who wills their salvation even as a shepherd desires the recovery of a lost sheep." This parable appears in Luke xv. 1-7 with a different context, and was probably employed on two separate occasions. The substance of the thought is the same in both places, but with a slight difference in the application. In the present passage, the similitude refers to possible transgressions which may follow from the sin of those who cause the little ones to offend. In St. Luke the image of the lost sheep refers to actual transgressors, the

13 And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that *sheep*, than of the ninety and nine which went not astray.

14 Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish.

15 ¶ Moreover [e] if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.

[e] Lev. 19. 17. Luke 17. 3.

16 But if he will not hear *thee*, *then* take with thee one or two more, that in [f] the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

[f] Deut. 19. 15. John 8. 17. 2 Cor. 13. 1. Heb. 10. 28.

17 And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an [g] heathen man and a publican.

[g] 1 Cor. 5. 9. 2 Thes. 3. 14.

---

publicans and sinners, despised as such by the self-righteous Pharisees and Scribes.

*and goeth into the mountains.*] Perhaps rather, Doth he not leave the ninety and nine on the mountains, and goeth and seeketh, &c. The original admits of either rendering, according to punctuation; but the expression, "on the mountains" seems to correspond to "in the wilderness" (Luke xv. 4). The parallel passage (Ezek. xxxiv. 6) is not decisive in favour of either rendering.

**13.** *which went not astray.*] The direct application of these words is not so obvious as in the corresponding passage of St. Luke, and it may be doubted whether any stress is intended to be placed upon them. Many commentators, both among the Fathers and among later writers, understand them as relating to the angels who have not fallen; but it is perhaps more natural to interpret them, with Maldonatus, as illustrating the greatness of God's love to man, so great that, had only one man out of the race been lost, He would have sent His Son for the salvation of that one, as the shepherd seeks for the one lost sheep of his flock. Thus understood the force of the parable is not weakened by the fact that all men alike have sinned and all can find salvation only through Christ.

**15.** *If thy brother shall trespass against thee, &c.*] After warning the disciples against causing others to offend, our Lord proceeds to say what should be their own conduct with regard to offences committed against themselves. The context would naturally lead us to interpret the words *trespass against thee*, in the first instance, of such offences as furnish temptation to sin; though the expression will also include all wrongs committed by one brother (*i.e.* Christian) against another.

The words, *against thee* are omitted in some MSS and recent editions, so as to extend the precept to sins in general; but it is more easy to account for their omission, supposing them genuine, than for their interpolation if spurious. The reply of St. Peter, verse 21, seems to show that the discourse has hitherto been of personal wrongs. It must be admitted, however, that in the parallel passage (Luke xvii. 3) the preponderance of authority is against the received text.

*hast gained thy brother.*] *I.e.* to the communion of the Church from which, by continuing obstinate, he would be excluded. (Compare St. Paul's use of the same word, 1 Cor. ix. 19-22. See also 1 Pet. iii. 1.)

**16.** *every word may be established.*] *I.e.* that the cause of dispute between you (ῥῆμα = דבר in the sense of *cause at law*) may be determined by the number of witnesses required by the law. (See Deut. xix. 15, which is here cited according to the LXX.) The same words are cited by St. Paul (2 Cor. xiii. 1), probably with reference to an intended judicial inquiry into the disorders of the Corinthian Church.

**17.** *unto the church.*] *I.e.* to the general body of believers. The word must be understood in the same sense as in ch. xvi. 18, and will denote in the first instance the whole Christian body, over whom authority is expressly given, first to St. Peter (ch. xvi. 19), and now to all the Apostles (verse 18). But in course of time, as the Church became more numerous, and spread over different places, a similar jurisdiction would of necessity be exercised by particular Churches in each locality, though still in subordination to the apostolic authority. Thus St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 12) speaks of the Corinthian Church as judging them that are within, while yet claiming for himself the right to direct their judgments, and to pronounce judgment himself when necessary.

*let him be unto thee as an heathen, &c.*] Literally, "as the heathen and the publican" (the article expressing the class): *i.e.* treat him as those classes of persons are treated by

h John 20. 23. 1 Cor. 5. 4.

18 Verily I say unto you, h Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

19 Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven.

20 For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

21 ¶ Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? i till seven times?

i Luke 17. 4.

22 Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven.

23 ¶ Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king,

---

10, 28

the Jews—avoid social intercourse with him. (For the Jewish practice, see ch. ix. 11; Acts xi. 3; for the Christian adoption of it, see 1 Cor. v. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.) The latter passage shews the spirit in which this precept is to be obeyed, as a rule necessary for the discipline of the Church, but without enmity towards the person of the offender.

**18.** *Whatsoever ye shall bind, &c.*] The promise before given to St. Peter (see above on ch. xvi. 19) is now extended to all the Apostles, to whom is committed in the first instance the power of laying down the conditions of admission to or exclusion from the Church. The transition from the singular to the plural (whatsoever *ye* shall bind) should be noticed. The former verse seems to relate to the conduct of members of the Church in general; the present, to the authority given to the Apostles as rulers of the Church, whose sentence of exclusion should be binding in the sight of God, being pronounced under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, who came to guide them into all truth. (Cf. John xvi. 13; 1 Cor. v. 3, 4.)

**19.** *two of you.*] Some MSS have the word 'any;' but the reading followed by the A.V. is probably the true one, and is more emphatic. The promise of the divine sanction to the sentence of the Apostles is now made part of a more general promise that God will grant whatever two of them shall unite in asking. The reference in the first instance is to the authority committed to the Apostles, and to the united prayer with which its exercise would naturally be accompanied. A similar power of discipline must, from the nature of the case, be entrusted to the rulers of the Church in all ages, so far as regards the formal power of excommunication. The divine sanction of the sentence, directly promised to the Apostles, is implied to others only on the assumption that their power is exercised in the Apostolic spirit of prayer, and under like government by the Spirit and Word of God.

**20.** *For where two or three are gathered together, &c.*] The limitation "of you" is now omitted, and the promise of divine authority specially made to the Apostles is now based upon a more general promise of Christ's presence with all who shall be gathered together in His name. This must not be understood as "a generalisation of the idea of the Church and the powers conferred on it." It is a general promise that Christ will hear the united prayers of any of His true followers; and the same promise is elsewhere made to individuals (Matt. vii. 7, 8; Luke xi. 9, 10; 1 John iii. 22, v. 14, 15), which must be understood with the condition expressed in the last of these passages, "if we ask any thing according to His will, He heareth us."

*in my name.*] *I.e.* with entire faith and trust in me. (Compare 1 Sam. xvii. 45; Ps. xx. 7; John xiv. 12, 13.)

21-35. THE GREAT LESSON OF FORGIVENESS.

**21.** *till seven times.*] The Jewish doctors allowed forgiveness only for three offences. (See Lightfoot on this place.) The number seven may perhaps have been suggested by Prov. xxiv. 16.

**22.** *seventy times seven.*] This expression has been variously interpreted as meaning seven times seventy (490), or seventy seven times. The latter is probably the meaning, as the same expression occurs Gen. iv. 24 (LXX) where the Hebrew signifies *seventy and seven.* Here, however, it is not to be understood literally, but only as signifying an indefinitely large number. "The inquiry of St. Peter," says Olshausen, "seemed to presuppose a *right*, according to which man might act at his own discretion in bestowing forgiveness or withholding it. The Saviour explains that nothing of this kind existed: he who was himself in debt for *his all* could advance a claim for *nothing*."

**23.** *Therefore.*] Because there is no definite limit to forgiveness among Christians, the kingdom of heaven (the Christian Church) is likened, &c.

which would take account of his servants.

24 And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand [1]talents.

[1] *A talent is 750 ounces of silver, which after five shillings the ounce is 187l. 10s.*

25 But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made.

26 The servant therefore fell down, and [1]worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all.

[1] *Or, besought him.*

27 Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt.

28 But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellowservants, which owed him an hundred [1]pence: and he laid hands on him, and took *him* by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest.

[1] *The Roman penny is the eighth part of an ounce, which after five shillings the ounce is seven pence halfpenny.*

29 And his fellowservant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all.

30 And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt.

31 So when his fellowservants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done.

32 Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me:

33 Shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellowservant, even as I had pity on thee?

34 And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him.

35 So likewise shall my heavenly

---

**24.** *ten thousand talents.*] The Attic talent of silver was equivalent to about 243*l.* 15*s.* English money; so that ten thousand talents would not fall far short of two millions and a half English. The expression is here perhaps used indefinitely for a very large sum; yet it might be understood literally if we suppose, with Archbishop Trench, that the servant in question is a satrap or governor of a province, who should have remitted the revenues of his province to the royal treasury. (Cf. Esther iii. 9.) If we suppose the Jewish standard to be adopted, the amount will be still larger; the Jewish silver talent being equivalent to 406*l.* 5*s.* English, and the gold talent to double that sum.

**25.** *to be sold.*] The Mosaic Law allowed the sale of an insolvent debtor, apparently with his family (see Levit. xxv. 39, 41; Deut. xv. 12; 2 Kings iv. 1). But from the mention of the prison and the tormentors, which were not part of the Jewish Law, it is probable that the imagery is borrowed from a foreign country.

**26.** *I will pay thee all.*] "We may detect in these words the voice of self-righteousness, imagining that, if only time were allowed, it could make good all the shortcomings of the past. Thus the words are exceedingly important, as very much explaining to us the later conduct of this man. It is clear that he whom this servant represents had never come to a true recognition of the immensity of his debt. Little, in the subjective measure of his own estimate, was forgiven him, and therefore he loved little, or not at all." (Archbishop Trench.)

**28.** *an hundred pence.*] Literally, *an hundred denarii.* The Roman *denarius*, commonly rendered *a penny*, was really equivalent to about 8½*d.* of our money.

**29.** *all.*] This word is not found in the best MSS, and may be omitted. F. C. C.

**34.** *the tormentors.*] This word probably signifies more than "keepers of the prison," as it is sometimes interpreted. Though there is no evidence of torture being applied to debtors under the Jewish Law, yet the practice was not unknown in other countries. Dr. Arnold ('History of Rome,' i. p. 135) contrasts the merciful provisions of the Jewish Law with the severities sanctioned by the Roman (see Aulus Gellius, xx. 1, 45-50; Livy, ii. 23); and Archbishop Trench remarks that in the East, where there is a continual suspicion that those who may appear the poorest are actually in possession of secret hoards of wealth, the torture would be often applied, as it is now, to make the debtor reveal those hoards, or in order to wring the money from the compassion of his friends.

**35.** *So likewise.*] (Cf. Ecclus. xxviii. 3, 4.)

Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.

---

*their trespasses.*] So one of the oldest MSS, and some ancient versions: but the words are omitted in other MSS, and by late editors. The sense is complete without them. F.C.C.

---

## NOTE to CHAPTER XVIII. ON THE LATTER PART OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY, FROM HIS DEPARTURE FROM GALILEE TO HIS FINAL ENTRY INTO JUDEA.

The probable chronological relation between St. Matthew and the other two Synoptic Evangelists, down to the end of ch. xviii., has already been pointed out in the notes on chaps. viii. 14, ix. *ad fin.*, xii. 1, 46, xiv. 1, 13. It appears that, down to the end of the 18th chapter, the narrative of St. Matthew, though exhibiting some differences as regards arrangement of events and fulness of detail, corresponds in substance with those portions of the other two Synoptists which terminate at Mark ix. 50, Luke ix. 50. In the latter part of this narrative, St. Luke is far less full than the other Evangelists; the small portion of ch. ix., from verse 18 to verse 50, being all that he has given of the history of our Lord's ministry between the Feeding of the Five Thousand and His final departure from Galilee; a period corresponding to Matt. xiv. 22 to xviii. 35, Mark vi. 45 to ix. 50,[1] and embracing nearly six months, from the Passover (John vi. 4) to a time shortly before the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 2). The brevity of this part of St. Luke's narrative contrasts remarkably with the fulness of that which follows (ix. 51 to xviii. 14), which treats of a period scarcely noticed at all by the other Evangelists, a period of nearly six months more from our Lord's departure from Galilee to a short time before His final visit to Jerusalem at the Passover at which He suffered. The silence of the first two Gospels with regard to this period is partly supplied by some incidental notices in St. John, which harmonise in a remarkable manner with the more detailed account of St. Luke.

It will be observed that St. Luke, in this part of his narrative, mentions on three different occasions the circumstance of our Lord's journeying to or towards Jerusalem. On the first occasion we read that "when the time was come (or rather, 'when the days were being accomplished') that He should be received up, He stedfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem."[2] On the second, we read that, "He went through the cities and villages, teaching and journeying towards Jerusalem."[3] In the third, that "as He went to Jerusalem He passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee."[4] St. John in like manner records three different journeys to or towards Jerusalem within the same period: the first from Galilee at the time of the Feast of Tabernacles:[5] the second from the place where John baptized (Bethabara, or Bethany beyond Jordan) to Bethany in Judea, on the occasion of the death of Lazarus;[6] the third from Ephraim to Bethany, and thence to Jerusalem six days before the Passover.[7] St. Matthew and St. Mark make no mention of the two

---

[1] Bp. Ellicott, who notices this difference, observes that St. Luke's design is to record events rather than discourses, while this portion of our Lord's ministry seems to have been devoted to local teaching and preaching rather than to displays of miraculous power. 'Lectures on the Life of our Lord,' p. 204.

[2] Luke ix. 51. Notwithstanding the attempt of Wieseler to give a different meaning to this passage, it is hardly possible to understand the words τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ as meaning anything else than "the days of His ascension." (Cf. Acts i. 2.) But the words ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι do not mean when the time "was come," but while it "was being accomplished." The expression "the days of His ascension" may be understood as embracing the whole of the period preparatory to that event, after our Lord had foretold His death and resurrection, and had commenced the movements which ended in the accomplishment of His prediction. (Cf. Ellicott, 'Lectures,' p. 243.)

[3] Luke xiii. 22.

[4] Luke xvii. 11.

[5] John vii. 10.

[6] John x. 40, xi. 7.

[7] John xi. 54, xii. 1. (Cf. Wieseler, 'Chron. Syn.,' p. 290, Eng. Tr.) The narrative of St. John seems to imply another journey to Jerusalem at the feast of the Dedication, and this journey may perhaps be identified with the second of those mentioned by St. Luke. Patrizzi ('De Evang.,' Lib. iii. Disc. xlviii.) agrees with Wieseler as to the occasion of this journey, but adopts a different explanation of the ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ, John vii. 10. He supposes that our Lord, when refused hospitality by the Samaritans, crossed the Jordan and travelled through the desert country on the other side, and he identifies this journey with that of Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1.

former of these journeys, but proceed at once from our Lord's departure from Galilee to His final journey to Jerusalem, which they tell us was through the coasts of Judea beyond Jordan.[1]

If, then, we can identify the three journeys mentioned by St. John with the corresponding three notices in St. Luke, it will follow that there is no discrepancy between the latter Evangelist and the other two synoptists, but merely that the one records a group of events which the others omit. And there is important incidental evidence in favour of such an identification. As regards the first journey to the Feast of Tabernacles, St. John tells us that it was taken "not openly, but as it were in secret;" and we may also infer that it was performed rapidly, having been commenced after His brethren had gone up. This coincides with the statement of St. Luke, who represents our Lord as travelling through Samaria, which was a shorter and yet a less frequented route than that through Peræa.[2] It also explains the conduct of the Samaritans on this occasion, as contrasted with their reception of Him on a former journey (John iv. 40). A Jew, journeying hastily towards Jerusalem at the time of one of the great feasts, would excite the national and religious hostility of the Samaritans far more than one travelling northward with no apparent religious purpose.[3] There is also a remarkable coincidence with regard to the third journey. St. Luke tells us that it was "through the midst of Samaria and Galilee"—an order the reverse of that which would have been necessary in a journey taken directly from north to south. Here St. John comes to our aid by showing that the starting-point of the journey was not any place in Galilee, but Ephraim, on the southern border of Samaria;[4] and St. Matthew and St. Mark complete the coincidence by telling us that our Lord's last journey was through the coasts of Judea beyond Jordan.[5] The entire route is thus given by the different writers: first, from Ephraim northwards through Samaria into Galilee; then by the more usual road from Galilee to Jerusalem, through Peræa, and across the Jordan to Jericho and Jerusalem.

We have thus an explanation of the omission by St. Matthew and St. Mark of many important circumstances recorded by St. Luke, such as the rejection of our Lord by the Samaritans, the mission of the Seventy, the visit to Martha and Mary, the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Barren Fig-tree, the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward, the Rich Man and Lazarus, the importunate Widow, the Pharisee and the Publican, &c. All these belong to the period which it did not come within the plan of the former Evangelists to narrate—the period between the close of our Lord's ministry in Galilee and His entry into Judea from beyond Jordan, on His last journey to Jerusalem. The place for this portion of St. Luke in a continuous narrative will be between the 18th and 19th chapter of St. Matthew, or between the 9th and 10th of St. Mark.

Had the narrative of St. Luke proceeded continuously from the end of the 10th to the beginning of the 13th chapter, there would be but little difficulty in treating this part of his gospel as a consecutive account of the events intervening between the close of our Lord's ministry in Galilee and His last visit to Judea and Jerusalem. But the 11th and 12th chapters present features which it is scarcely possible to explain on this supposition, though various attempts have been made to do so.[6] The parallels which occur between these two chapters and various portions of St. Matthew's gospel are too numerous and too close to admit of being all referred to distinct though similar occasions, and if accepted as identical

---

[1] Matthew xix. 1; Mark x. 1.

[2] Cf. Wieseler, 'Chron. Syn.,' p. 292, Eng. Tr.; Ellicott, 'Lectures,' pp. 122, 248.

[3] Cf. Wieseler, p. 293; Ellicott, p. 249.

[4] The city of Ephraim may perhaps be identified with Ophrah of Benjamin (Josh. xviii. 23; cf. 1 Sam. xiii. 17). Robinson ('Researches,' vol. ii. p. 124) suggests the identity of this Ophrah with the modern Taijibeh, 4 miles E.N.E. of Bethel and 16 from Jerusalem. Wieseler ('Chr. Syn., p. 291, Eng. Tr.) infers from Josephus ('B. J.,' iv. 99) that it was south of Bethel and thus nearer to Jerusalem. Its position must be near the borders of Samaria and Judea, but probably within the latter province. Cf. Wieseler, *l. c.*

[5] Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1. This coincidence would be almost certain if we could retain the received text of St. Mark, διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. But the same interpretation is compatible with what is probably the true text, καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. The καὶ may be interpreted as explanatory (*und zwar*, Meyer): "He came into the country bordering Judea and beyond Jordan;" *i. e.* into Peræa the boundary of Judea on the Jordan side. The words need not mean that he passed through Judea into Peræa.

[6] Thus Greswell ('Harmonia' P. iv. sect. xxv–xlv; 'Dissertations,' ii. 517–542) treats the whole narrative (Luke xi. 51, xvii. 19) as continuous and peculiar to St. Luke. Wieseler ('Chr. Syn.,' p. 297, Eng. Tr.) maintains the chronological order of St. Luke, though without harmonising in detail, and is followed more elaborately by Tischendorf ('Synops. Evang.,' §§ 77–106). The same principle is adopted by Krafft ('Chr. u. Harm.'), §§ 107–147). On the other hand Robinson ('Harmony,' Part vi. Eng. ed. p. 92) allows that this portion of St. Luke is wanting in exact chronological arrangement, a conclusion which seems more nearly to agree with the actual phenomena.

cannot be harmonised according to St. Luke's arrangement without extreme violence to the text of St. Matthew.[1] At the same time it may be doubted whether the text of St. Luke taken by itself requires or even suggests such an arrangement. One noteworthy feature of this portion of the gospel is the absence of all definite marks of time or place. At the beginning of the 11th chapter we are merely told that our Lord "was praying in a certain place;" at verse 14, that he "was casting out a devil, and it was dumb;" at verse 29 His words are only referred to some occasion "when the people were gathered thick together." In the 12th chapter the words spoken to the disciples at verse 22, though akin in matter to the preceding parable, have no note to show that they were spoken at the same time, as is also the case with the words addressed to the multitude at verse 54. In one or two instances, indeed, there is clear evidence that St. Luke is recording an event not narrated by the other Evangelists, and these may possibly, though by no means certainly, be narrated in their chronological place, though in juxtaposition with others probably belonging to a different occasion. Thus the parallel between Luke xi. 33 and viii. 16 shows that the Evangelist was aware of two occasions at least on which similar words were used; the former corresponding to Mark iv. 21, while the latter, which can hardly be identified with Matt. v. 15, is probably recorded by St. Luke alone. A clearer instance is afforded by Luke xi. 39-52, together with the parallel in Matt. xiii. 23-36. By comparing Luke xx. 45-47 it appears here also that this Evangelist was aware of two occasions on which our Lord spoke in a similar manner of the Scribes and Pharisees; the latter of which corresponds in time to the one occasion recorded by St. Matthew, while the former has many coincidences with it in matter. It is possible that St. Matthew may, in this, as well as in other instances, have combined in his narrative the substance of two distinct though similar discourses, one of which may belong to the place assigned to it in Luke xi. 39-51. It is probable also that Luke xx. 45-51 is but an abridged report of the second of these discourses, which may have contained many things repeated from the first and recorded in that repetition by St. Matthew. But though various conjectures may be hazarded as to the details of those two discourses, the fact that there were two is evident from the narrative of St. Luke alone. A similar explanation may perhaps apply to Luke xii. 39-46, compared with Matt. xxiv. 42-51, though in this case there is not the same positive evidence of two separate discourses.

But when every allowance is made for such instances as may fairly be explained on the hypothesis of similar though distinct events, it seems impossible to apply this hypothesis to all the instances adduced in the preceding table, and equally impossible to construct a satisfactory harmony on the assumption that St. Luke in this part of his gospel is following a strict chronological order, and consequently that all the parallel places in St. Matthew which cannot be regarded as distinct events, must be removed from their contexts, and placed between his 18th and 19th chapters. There remains, however, a third hypothesis, as advocated by Dr. Robinson, and which seems on the whole the best suited to the facts of the case, namely, that St. Luke, at the end of his narrative of our Lord's ministry in Galilee, and of His journey through Samaria took occasion to insert, by way as it were of appendix to this part of his narrative, an account of various events belonging to the earlier ministry, which, for some reason or other, he had not narrated in their proper chronological places. The absence of definite marks of time and place appears to give some support to this conjecture. If we suppose, with Wieseler, that the mission of the Seventy took place during the journey through Samaria, or just at the close of it, the arrangement of Luke x. may be easily accommodated to this hypothesis. The return of the Seventy would naturally be related out of its chronological order, to place it in a continuous narrative with the mission, and the remaining contents of ch. x. were probably immediately subsequent to the return and narrated along with it. The mission of the Seventy closes the ministry of our Lord in Galilee and Samaria, and chapters xi. and xii. form an appendix to this part of the narrative. Such an hypothesis is not invalidated by words of the Evangelist himself (ch.

---

[1] The following table of parallels will show how much dislocation the gospel of St. Matthew must undergo to be fitted to such an arrangement :—

| | *St. Luke.* | | *St. Matthew.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| (*a*) | xi. 2-4 | = | vi. 9-13 |
| (*b*) | 9-13 | = | vii. 7-11 |
| (*c*) | 14-32 | = | xii. 22-45 |
| (*d*) | 33 | = | v. 15 |
| (*e*) | 34 | = | vi. 22, 23 |
| (*f*) | 39-51 | = | xxiii. 23-36 |
| (*g*) | xii. 1 | = | xvi. 6 |
| (*h*) | 2-9 | = | x. 26-33 |
| (*i*) | xii. 10 | = | xii. 31, 32 |
| (*k*) | 11, 12 | = | x. 19, 20 |
| (*l*) | 22-31 | = | vi. 25-33 |
| (*m*) | 33, 34 | = | vi. 20, 21 |
| (*n*) | 37-46 | = | xxiv. 42-51 |
| (*o*) | 51-53 | = | x. 34-36 |
| (*p*) | 54-56 | = | xvi. 1-3 |
| (*q*) | 58, 59 | = | v. 25, 26 |

i. 3), in which he speaks of himself as having accurately traced (παρηκολουθηκότι ἀκριβῶς) all things from the beginning (ἄνωθεν), and speaks of his intention to write consecutively (καθεξῆς). These expressions mean no more than that he had traced the entire history of our Lord's life on earth from its commencement, instead of confining himself to one or more detached portions of it, and that he intended to write on a definite principle of arrangement. This principle may, perhaps, be chronological (though this is not implied in the word itself), but it may also be of another kind. Ebrard ('Gospel History,' p. 99, Eng. Tr.) has suggested a different principle of arrangement, which is no doubt difficult to substantiate in all its details, but which is quite as compatible with the word καθεξῆς as a strictly chronological order. Even supposing the arrangement to be mainly chronological, there would be no inconsistency in an occasional departure from this order, to bring into juxtaposition events otherwise connected with each other, provided that this were done of set purpose, and not at random. Nor is it impossible that it might be part of this very plan to arrange in the form of an appendix events which had not found a place in the body of the narrative. There is nothing inconsistent with the inspiration of the Evangelist in the supposition that, though accurately informed in respect of all that he has actually stated, he was not informed of the chronological plan of certain events, and consequently did not state it. Such a supposition is surely tenable, unless we maintain the gratuitous assumption that whenever such information had not reached the Evangelist from other sources, it would inevitably be supplied by divine revelation. (A different view from that which Dean Mansel here, partially at least, adopts will be advocated in the supplemental note on Luke ix. 51. The results of some later investigations are there presented. It must, however, be noted that the Dean's position is maintained by Rösger, 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1876, and by Weiss, 'Matthæus-Evangelium.' F. C. C.)

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

2 *Christ healeth the sick:* 3 *answereth the Pharisees concerning divorcement:* 10 *sheweth when marriage is necessary:* 13 *receiveth little children:* 16 *instructeth the young man how to attain eternal life,* 20 *and how to be perfect:* 23 *telleth his disciples how hard it is for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God,* 27 *and promiseth reward to those that forsake any thing to follow him.*

AND it came to pass, [a]*that* when Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed from Galilee, and came into the coasts of Judæa beyond Jordan;

[a] Mark 10. 1.

2 And great multitudes followed him; and he healed them there.

3 ¶ The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto

---

CHAP. XIX.—1, 2. THE DEPARTURE FROM GALILEE.

1. *he departed from Galilee.*] This is the termination of our Lord's *recorded* ministry in Galilee. Afterwards we have only a passage through its borders, mentioned Luke xvii. 11. The present departure probably corresponds to Luke ix. 51.

*into the coasts of Judæa beyond Jordan.*] This does not mean that any part of Judea itself extended beyond Jordan; but that Jesus came into the country beyond Jordan, which with the river itself formed the eastern boundary of Judea. It has been questioned to what journey these words refer. If the received text of Mark x. 1 be adopted, it is natural to understand them as relating to our Lord's last journey from Ephraim to Jerusalem (John xi. 54, xii. 1), corresponding to Luke xvii. 11. And the same interpretation is also compatible with the amended text of St. Mark (see note at the end of last chapter). Dean Alford, however, interprets the present passage and that of St. Mark as referring to the journey from Jerusalem to the country beyond Jordan (John x. 40). The former supposition, however, seems better suited to the general course of the narrative. The best mode of harmonising this verse with the narratives of St. Luke and St. John, is to suppose a break in the middle: "He departed from Galilee, and (after an interval not recorded by St. Matthew) came into Judea by the way of Peræa." This journey will thus be distinguished from that of Luke ix. 51, which was by the way of Samaria.

3–10. LAW OF DIVORCEMENT.

3. *Is it lawful, &c.*] See on ch. v. 31. It is probable that our Lord's words in the Sermon on the Mount, may have reached the

him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?

4 And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, [l]that he which made *them* at the beginning made them male and female,

5 And said, [m]For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and [n]they twain shall be one flesh?

6 Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

7 They say unto him, [o]Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?

8 He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

9 [p]And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except

[l] Gen. 1. 27.
[m] Gen. 2. 24. Eph. 5. 31.
[n] 1 Cor. 6. 16.
[o] Deut. 24. 1.
[p] ch. 5. 32. Mark 10. 11. Luke 16. 18. 1 Cor. 7. 11.

---

ears of the Pharisees and induced them to ask this question, in order to bring Him into direct antagonism, either with the disciples of Hillel, or with those of Shammai. Our Lord's reply avoids the snare, by referring to the primitive institution of marriage, prior to the Mosaic Law.

**5.** *And said.*] The words (Gen. ii. 24) may, as far as construction is concerned, be regarded either as a part of Adam's speech, or as an interpretation of the sacred historian. The present verse favours the latter interpretation. (See on Gen. ii. 24.)

*for this cause.*] The citation is made nearly verbatim from the LXX, the words "for this cause" having reference to the preceding verse in Genesis. For the same reason, the words "they twain" are retained, which are found in the LXX, but not in the original.

**7.** *Why did Moses then command.*] St. Mark, while substantially agreeing with St. Matthew, slightly varies the form of the narrative. He represents our Lord as saying, "What did Moses command you?" This has been considered by some critics as a mark of greater originality (Meyer); but on the other hand it may be said, that the very use of this word, representing a mere permission as a command, is natural in the mouths of the Pharisees seeking to convict Jesus of an apparent contradiction of the Law of Moses. It is, perhaps, more probable that St. Matthew gives the original form of the narrative, which St. Mark relates in an abbreviated statement.

**9.** *For fornication.*] For the meaning of this word, see ch. v. 32. It should be observed, that St. Mark in the parallel passage (x. 11), and St. Luke (xvi. 18) in a passage which has a different context, but is, perhaps, parallel to this verse or to ch. v. 32, omit the exception in the case of fornication. Does this mean that our Lord on another occasion forbade divorce unconditionally, or that His words on this occasion are so to be interpreted? or does it simply mean that the other two Evangelists have given an abridged form of His teaching, which is more exactly stated by St. Matthew? The latter seems by far the most probable supposition. With regard to St. Mark, there cannot be the least doubt that his narrative is a report of the same conversation as that here recorded by St. Matthew; and unless we suppose that the latter Evangelist interpolated the exception, we must regard his report as in this respect more exact than St. Mark's. Whatever may have been the cause of the surmise, concerning which various very unsatisfactory conjectures have been hazarded, it seems reasonable to interpret the shorter record by St. Luke, and to recognise in St. Matthew's account the whole teaching of Christ on this important question. Cf. Bishop Cosin on dissolution of marriage, 'Works,' iv. 490; Bishop Hall, 'Cases of Conscience,' Dec. iv., case 3.

*and shall marry another.*] The natural interpretation of these words, is to forbid a second marriage in all cases of divorce but one, and by implication to permit it in that one, and this view is learnedly maintained by Bishop Cosin, *l. c.*, as well as by Bishop Hall, *l. c.*, and Hammond 'Of Divorces,' § 28, 31. These authorities, however, limit the liberty of re-marriage to the innocent party, a restriction which, however justifiable on other grounds, is not warranted by the present passage. (See the next notes.) As a matter of fact, the primitive Church, while discouraging the re-marriage of the innocent party, did not positively forbid it; and individual fathers have given their opinions, both for and against it. (See Bingham, B. xxii. 2, 12; Hammond, *l. c.*, § 30.) The Church of Rome, at the Council of Trent, declared that the marriage bond was not dissoluble, even by adultery, and that neither party could marry during the life of the other. The Church of England has never authoritatively sanctioned any other separation than that *à mensâ et thoro;* and this with

*it be* for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

10 ¶ His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with *his* wife, it is not good to marry.

11 But he said unto them, All *men* cannot receive this saying, save *they* to whom it is given.

12 For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from *their* mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive *it*, let him receive *it*.

13 ¶ [a]Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put *his* hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them.

[a] Mark 10. 13. Luke 18. 15.

---

an express prohibition of re-marriage (Canon 107). These decisions must be considered on distinct grounds from the interpretation of the present passage.

*committeth adultery.*] *I.e.* by marrying another woman while the first is still his wife in the sight of God. In ch. v. 32 it said that "he causeth her (the divorced wife) to commit adultery," *i.e.* by giving her the opportunity of being nominally married to another man.

*her which is put away.*] The meaning of this expression must be determined by the context. The literal translation of the original, both here and at ch. v. 32, is, whoso marrieth **her when put away**: *i.e.* the woman whose divorce has just before been prohibited; not, as it is sometimes rendered, "a divorced woman" [under any circumstances]. If we had St. Matthew's gospel alone to consider, this passage would not be naturally understood as forbidding re-marriage in the one case in which divorce is lawful; the words would be only the logical sequence of the previous clause: the man who unlawfully puts away his wife and marries another, commits adultery, because the divorced woman is still really his wife; and, by parity of reasoning, whoever marries the divorced woman commits adultery, because she is still the wife of another man. The logical sequence is lost if the second clause is made more extensive than the first. The only consistent ground on which it can be maintained that marriage with a divorced person is always unlawful, is the assumption that the previous divorce is always unlawful.

But while it may fairly be maintained that the present passage does not prohibit divorce *à vinculo matrimonii*, and consequently re-marriage, in the one case of adultery, it affords no sanction to the distinction drawn between the guilty and the innocent party, as regards the permission to marry again. Such a distinction may or may not be desirable on the ground of social expediency; but it derives no support from the present passage. Marriage with a divorced woman, so far as it is forbidden, is forbidden, not because it is socially inexpedient, nor even because it is morally culpable; but specially because it is adulterous; *i.e.* because she is still the wife of the man from whom she has been nominally divorced. But if so, he is still her husband, and both are equally unable to marry another. Nor yet can this distinction be maintained from 1 Cor. vii. 11, for the context seems to shew that St. Paul is not contemplating the case of adultery at all.

(The last clause is omitted in most ancient MSS, and by some late editors. It is supposed to be derived from the parallel passages: but St. Matthew is not wont to abbreviate our Lord's discourses, and there can be no doubt that these words were spoken by Him. F. C. C.)

**11.** *this saying.*] *I.e.* the saying of the disciples, that it is not good to marry. There are those whose vocation is for the married life under the Christian restrictions already stated, while there are others whose vocation for various reasons is rather for a single life.

**12.** *have made themselves eunuchs.*] *I.e.* have renounced all desire for a married life, believing themselves able to serve God better as unmarried. (Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 7.)

*let him receive it.*] These words may be interpreted either as a command or as a permission; but in this case the two are identical. For the words are addressed only to him who can receive the saying; *i.e.* to him who is convinced that in his own case it is not good to marry.

### 13–15. Blessing of Children.

**13.** *Then were there brought, &c.*] At this point St. Luke's narrative, which from ch. ix. 51 to ch. xviii. 14 has been independent of the other two Synoptists, again begins to run parallel with them at ch. xviii. 15. The concurrence of St. Matthew and St. Mark seems to shew that this occurrence is immediately connected in point of time with that narrated in the preceding verses. If so, it is worthy of notice that this action of our

14 But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven.

15 And he laid *his* hands on them, and departed thence.

16 ¶ [b] And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?

[b] Mark 10. 17. Luke 18. 18.

17 And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is* none good but one, *that is*, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.

18 He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, [c] Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness,

[c] Ex. 20. 13.

19 Honour thy father and *thy* mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

20 The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?

---

Lord, in blessing little children, and thus sanctifying the marriage-tie and its offspring, should have followed a saying which His disciples erroneously understood as involving the consequence that it is not good to marry, and in which the perverse ingenuity of a modern critic (see Strauss, 'L. J.,' § 79) has attempted to discover a trace of the asceticism of the Essenes.

*little children.*] St. Luke's expression, *infants* (τὰ βρέφη), seems to shew that some at least of these children were of too tender an age to be conscious receivers of our Lord's teaching; and, indeed, it is not said that they were brought to be taught, but "that He should put his hands on them, and pray." This incident as recorded by St. Mark is most appropriately read in our own office for the baptism of infants, wherein young children are in like manner presented to Christ. The laying on of hands was the usual accompaniment of blessing. (See Gen. xlviii. 14.)

**14.** *of such is the kingdom of heaven.*] See on ch. xviii. 3, 4.

16–26. THE YOUNG RULER.

**16.** *one came.*] In verse 20 he is called a young man (νεανίσκος), and St. Luke adds that he was a ruler (ἄρχων). (Compare ch. ix. 18 with Luke viii. 41, and see note on the former passage.)

**17.** *Why callest thou, &c.*] This passage offers a considerable difficulty on account of the various readings of the text. The received text is identical with that of St. Mark and St. Luke. But the preponderance of MS authority is in favour of a different reading, which, omitting the epithet *good* in verse 16, gives the present sentence in a form which may be rendered, "Why askest thou me concerning good? there is one who is the good." This reading, though different in expression, will be similar in sense to the received text, if we understand it as meaning, "Why askest thou me concerning good? God, who alone is good, can alone shew thee what is good;" but the form of expression seems harsh and unnatural, and furnishes an internal probability against its genuineness, while the external evidence is in its favour. The variation, moreover, may be accounted for in two ways; for while it is possible that St. Matthew's language may have been altered *to* the received text to bring it into harmony with the other Evangelists, it is also possible that it may have been altered *from* the received text, on account of the supposed doctrinal difficulty of the latter. As Neander remarks ('Life of Christ,' p. 366, Eng. Tr.) the alternative reading "has not the air of originality: it was, perhaps, invented because Christ's declining the epithet *good* was a stumbling-block." The doctrinal question will be considered in connection with Mark x. 10, where the reading is not disputed.

**17.** *keep the commandments.*] God, who alone is good, can alone shew to man what is good, and He has shewn it in the commandments which He has given.

**20.** *All these things have I kept, &c.*] That this was no hypocritical boast, but the assertion of a man honestly desirous to do what was right according to his knowledge, appears from Mark x. 21, where it is said that "Jesus beholding him, loved him." But he had come to Christ to ask for a higher good than that which the precepts of the law enjoined; he came apparently desiring to be in some manner a disciple of Christ, and he is bidden to imitate those who had left all and followed Him.

*from my youth up.*] These words are omitted in some of the oldest MSS and versions, and may possibly be taken from the other gospels: but they may be safely retained, having good ancient authority. F. C. C.

21 Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go *and* sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come *and* follow me.

22 But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.

23 ¶ Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven.

24 And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.

25 When his disciples heard *it*, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved?

26 But Jesus beheld *them*, and said unto them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.

27 ¶ [d]Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?

[d] Mark 10. 28. Luke 18. 28.

28 And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, [e]ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

[e] Luke 22. 30.

29 And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake,

---

**21.** *If thou wilt be perfect.*] An expression probably suggested by the young man's question, "What lack I yet?" If thou wilt (so far as human power extends) supply all that is lacking.

**23.** *into the kingdom of heaven.*] *I. e.* into the Church of Christ, with the privation and self-denial which it required (see on ch. iii. 2, v. 3., xiii. 3). This verse must be understood with the explanation supplied by St. Mark, "how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God." Compare St. Paul's exhortation to rich members of the Church (1 Tim. vi. 17-19).

**24.** *It is easier for a camel, &c.*] A proverbial expression to denote a thing extremely difficult. (See Lightfoot on this passage.)

**26.** *with God all things are possible.*] Nothing but Divine Grace can touch the hearts of men who trust in riches.

27-30. THE REWARD OF CHRIST'S FOLLOWERS.

**28.** *in the regeneration.*] At the second coming of Christ. (Cf. Acts iii. 21; Rom. viii. 21; Rev. xxi. 5.)

*ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones.*] This promise is omitted by St. Mark and St. Luke in this place, but the latter introduces it with a different context at ch. xxii. 30. In the latter passage it is a confirmation by our Lord, just before His betrayal, of the promise which He had previously given on the present occasion. Whether this prediction is to be understood literally or figuratively, whether the twelve tribes are to be understood in the natural or the spiritual sense is a question on which nothing can be offered but conjecture. Like the corresponding apocalyptic vision (Rev. xxi.) its full meaning will probably be uncertain until its fulfilment. The interpretation which refers this promise to Christ's second coming, seems most suitable to the context, and is confirmed by the language of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3. Yet some eminent critics, among them Hammond and Rosenmüller, interpret it as referring chiefly to the Church of Christ upon earth. The former, understanding by the *regeneration* the spiritual kingdom of Christ, beginning with His resurrection, interprets this promise as meaning the same as that of the *giving the keys* (ch. xvi. 19): *i. e.* "the installing on them a power in the Church to which they were to succeed, under and after Him, upon His Ascension," yet so as not to exclude a future dignity in the world to come. The latter insists entirely on a similar interpretation. "Vos, discipuli mei, post meum in cælum reditum, docendo et salutariter agendo Israelitis publice consuletis; exponetis Judæis pro me opes doctrinæ divinæ, eosque jubebitis vitam omnem ad ejus nomen dirigere."

As the general promise to the followers of Christ at verse 29 relates partly to this life and partly to the life to come, it is possible that the present promise to the Apostles may include a similar twofold fulfilment; but to interpret it exclusively or principally of the Church on earth seems both inadequate to the natural force of the words, and inconsistent with the context in which they occur.

shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.

30 *f* But many *that are* first shall be last; and the last *shall be* first.

*f* ch. 20. 16. Mark 10. 31. Luke 13. 30.

## CHAPTER XX.

1 *Christ, by the similitude of the labourers in the vineyard, sheweth that God is debtor unto no man:* 17 *foretelleth his passion:* 20 *by answering the mother of Zebedee's children teacheth his disciples to be lowly:* 30 *and giveth two blind men their sight.*

FOR the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man *that is* an householder, which went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard.

2 And when he had agreed with the labourers for a [1]penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard.

3 And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the marketplace,

4 And said unto them; Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way.

5 Again he went out about the

[1] *The Roman penny is the eighth part of an ounce, which after five shillings the ounce is seven pence half penny.*

---

**29.** *shall receive an hundredfold.*] St. Mark and St. Luke add *in this time*, thus dividing the promise into two parts, the first relating to this world, the second to the world to come. St. Matthew omits the above words, but by using two separate verbs, *receive* and *inherit*, he seems to imply some distinction between the two rewards, and fully warrants us in understanding his language in the same sense as that of the other Evangelists. There is therefore, no ground for discovering (with Meyer) a discrepancy between the accounts. The meaning obviously is, that faith in Christ brings to the believer a happiness even in this life which far outweighs any temporal loss endured for His sake, and that Christ Himself will more than repay such loss. (Cf. Matt. xii. 49; 1 Tim. iv. 8.)

(For *an hundredfold*, Origen and two MSS, generally agreeing with him, have *manifold.* F. C. C.)

**30.** *But many that are first, &c.*] The division of chapters here interrupts the sense; for this verse serves to introduce the parable of the labourers and is illustrated by it.

### CHAP. XX.—1-16. PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD.

The spiritual meaning of this difficult parable, which is recorded by St. Matthew only, will be discussed at the end of the chapter.

**1.** *the kingdom of heaven.*] *I. e.* the Christian Church on earth. (See above on ch. xix. 23, and the references given there.)

*early in the morning.*] Gr. ἅμα πρωΐ. This must probably here be understood of sunrise, as commencing the first hour of the day; though it is not correct to say, that πρωΐ properly means sunrise as a fixed point of time. The word may denote any part of the forenoon (see Theophrastus, 'Fragm.,' v. 1, 9), though the context here, as in Mark xiii. 35, seems to fix it to the beginning of the day. *i. e.* sunrise.

**2.** *a penny a day.*] The Roman denarius, here translated *a penny*, was equal to about 8½*d.* English (see above on ch. xviii. 28). This was the usual pay of a Roman soldier at this time (see Tacitus, 'Ann.,' i. 17). In the Book of Tobit v. 14, the Greek drachma, which was about the same value as the denarius, is mentioned as the daily wages of a servant. That the payment was liberal, regard being had to the value of money at this time, see Greswell, 'Parables,' vol. iv. p. 332.

**3.** *about the third hour.*] *I. e.* at or near the end of the third hour, as appears from verse 12. This corresponds approximately to 9 o'clock in the morning, and the 6th, 9th, and 11th hours to 12, 3, and 5, respectively. The correspondence, except at noon, is only approximate, because in this division of hours the whole day, from sunrise to sunset, was divided into twelve equal parts, which of course would be of different lengths at different times of the year. This division, which was originally Babylonian (Herodot. ii. 109), and afterwards adopted by the Greeks and Romans, may possibly have been learnt by the Jews during the Babylonian captivity. The first mention of an hour in Scripture is in Daniel (iii. 5, 15, iv. 19, v. 5). If we suppose the season contemplated in the parable to be the same with that at which it was spoken, *i. e.* near the vernal equinox (one of the usual seasons of labour in vineyards; see Greswell, 'Parables,' iv. p. 323), the hours here mentioned will nearly coincide with the modern divisions mentioned above.

*idle.*] This word is omitted by most editors: but whether expressed or not, it is to be understood. F. C. C.

**4.** *whatsoever is right.*] This and the later hirings are distinguished from the first, by the fact that no definite sum is named as wages.

sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise.

6 And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle?

7 They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, *that* shall ye receive.

8 So when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the labourers, and give them *their* hire, beginning from the last unto the first.

9 And when they came that *were hired* about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny.

10 But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny.

11 And when they had received *it*, they murmured against the goodman of the house,

12 Saying, These last [1] have wrought *but* one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day.

[1] Or, *have continued one hour only.*

13 But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny?

14 Take *that* thine *is*, and go thy way: I will give unto this last, even as unto thee.

15 Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?

16 [g] So the last shall be first, and

[g] ch. 19. 30.

---

7. *and whatsoever, &c.*] This clause is omitted by late editors, following ℵ B D L Z; but it is supported by other MSS of high authority and by most ancient versions. It is not likely to have been interpolated. F. C. C.

8. *when even was come.*] At the close of the 12th hour, at sunset. According to the Mosaic Law the wages of a hired servant were to be paid before night (Levit. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 15; cf. Tobit iv. 14).

13. *Friend.*] Ἑταῖρε. This word does not necessarily imply a friendly feeling towards the person addressed. It is used again (ch. xxii. 12) to the guest who had not a wedding garment, and in ch. xxvi. 50, by our Lord to Judas. (Alford.)

14. *go thy way.*] This expression "hardly denotes (as Stier in his first edition) expulsion and separation from the householder and his employment: it is here only a word of course, commanding him to do what a paid labourer naturally should do." (Alford.)

15. *Is thine eye evil.*] *I.e.* art thou envious? "Envy is ever spoken of as finding its expression from the eye: Deut. xv. 9; 1 Sam. xviii. 9 ("Saul *eyed* David"); Prov. xxiii. 6, xxviii. 22; Tob. iv. 7; Ecclus. xiv. 10, xxi. 13; Mark vii. 22; indeed, the word *invidia* says as much, being, as Cicero observes ('Tusc.' iii. 9), a nimis *intuendo* fortunam alterius. The expression seems to have its origin in a belief, one of the widest spread in the world, of the eye being able to put forth positive powers of mischief. Thus, in Greek, the ὀφθαλμὸς βάσκανος and βασκαίνειν; in Italian, the mal-occhio; in French, the mauvais-œil; Persius, urentes oculos. (See Becker's 'Charikles,' vol. ii. p. 291.) We have on the other hand the ἀγαθὸς ὀφθαλμός, "the ungrudging eye" (Ecclus. xxxii. (xxxv.) 10).—Archbishop Trench.

*because I am good.*] *I.e.* because I am liberal, and give to others more than they have earned.

16. *So the last shall be first, &c.*] If we are to understand these words according to the mere narrative of the parable without reference to any further application, their natural meaning seems to be: "the last (in time) shall be as the first, and the first as the last," *i.e.* the last shall be raised to an equality with the first, and (consequently) the first reduced to an equality with the last—the words *first* and *last* being understood simply of the time of hiring. Nothing is said in the parable of an exchange of places, of the last being put *above* the first and the first *below* the last; and such an interpretation moreover gives an ambiguous meaning to the terms—the word *first* having the double meaning of *earliest in time* and *highest in reward*, and *last* in like manner meaning *latest in time* and *lowest in reward.* But the exact interpretation cannot be fully determined till the spiritual as well as the literal sense of the parable has been examined.

*for many be called, &c.*] These words are omitted in some of the oldest MSS and in some ancient versions. They are not likely to have been directly inserted in the text from ch. xxii. 14, where they occur in a totally

the first last: for many be called, but few chosen.

[h] Mark 10. 32. Luke 18. 31.

17 ¶ [h] And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them,

18 Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death,

[i] John 18. 32.

19 [i] And shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify *him*: and the third day he shall rise again.

[k] Mark 10. 35.

20 ¶ [k] Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping *him*, and desiring a certain thing of him.

21 And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom.

22 But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able.

23 And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am

---

different context, but they may possibly have been a marginal comment from that place, which became afterwards incorporated with the present text. It is possible, however, that they are part of the original text, omitted on account of their difficulty and apparent inconsistency with the general tenor of the parable. Supposing them to be genuine, they may perhaps be interpreted (with Meyer) as meaning, out of many called, few will receive a special reward; the majority, even of the first called will be only on an equality with the last. In ch. xxii. 14, they seem rather to indicate the entire rejection of many, of which there is no decisive indication in the present parable. (They are found in MSS of high authority, and in all versions excepting the Coptic and Æthiopian. F. C. C.)

17–19. PREDICTION OF DEATH.

**17.** *going up to Jerusalem.*] These words indicate the time at which our Lord crossed the Jordan on His last journey to Jerusalem. The parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, as Greswell remarks ('Diss.,' vol. ii. p. 543), is more likely to have been spoken in Peræa, which was rich in vineyards, than in the plain of Jericho where there were none.

**18.** *Behold, we go up, &c.*] From ch. xvi. 21 we learn that our Lord, during the last year of His ministry, repeatedly warned His disciples of His approaching sufferings and death and resurrection. Ch. xvii. 22, 23, is a record of one such warning. The present passage is another, more minute and definite as the time of accomplishment drew nigh.

*chief priests .... scribes.*] See on ch. ii. 4.

*they shall condemn him to death.*] Though the actual sentence was pronounced by Pilate (Luke xxiii. 24) it was at the instigation of the Jewish authorities (see ch. xxvii. 20), who had themselves already passed the same sentence in their own council, ch. xxvi. 66.

20–28. REQUEST OF SALOME.

**20.** *the mother.*] Her name was Salome, as appears from comparing ch. xxvii. 56 with Mark xv. 40. Her presence is not mentioned by St. Mark, but as she made the request in conjunction with her sons and in their behalf, the omission does not amount to a discrepancy.

**21.** *Grant that these, &c.*] The sons, in common with the other disciples, had heard our Lord's promise to those who had followed Him (ch. xix. 28). As two of the especially favoured among the disciples, they were emboldened to request special seats of honour among the thrones promised.

**22.** *Ye know not what ye ask.*] Ye know not that what ye ask as a place of honour is one of suffering also. (Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 12.)

*to drink of the cup.*] The images of the *cup* and the *baptism* are both applied by our Lord to His own sufferings; the former in His agony in Gethsemane, the latter in a saying recorded by St. Luke only, xii. 50. We may perhaps distinguish the two images by understanding (with Alford) the *cup* as denoting the inner and spiritual bitterness resembling the agony of the Lord Himself, and the *baptism*, the outer accession of persecution and trial through which we must pass to the kingdom of God. The latter, however, can hardly be limited to the signification of *Death* (Alford on Luke xii. 50), in which sense it would be applicable to St. James, the first martyr among the Apostles, but not to St. John. The clause mentioning the baptism in verses 22, 23, is omitted in some of the oldest MSS, and may possibly have been supplied from St. Mark x. 38, where see note.

baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father.

24 And when the ten heard *it*, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren.

25 But Jesus called them *unto him*, and said, [a] Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them.

[a] Luke 22. 25.

26 But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister;

27 And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant:

28 Even as the [b] Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

[b] Phil. 2. 7.

29 [c] And as they departed from Jericho, a great multitude followed him.

[c] Mark 10. 46. Luke 18. 35.

30 ¶ And, behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when they heard that Jesus passed by, cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, *thou* Son of David.

31 And the multitude rebuked them, because they should hold their peace: but they cried the more, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, *thou* Son of David.

32 And Jesus stood still, and called them, and said, What will ye that I shall do unto you?

33 They say unto him, Lord, that our eyes may be opened.

34 So Jesus had compassion *on them*, and touched their eyes: and immediately their eyes received sight, and they followed him.

---

**23.** *it shall be given.*] These words are not in the original, and this clause may be more literally translated "is not mine to give, except to those," &c. Christ is the giver, not, however, by way of favour to any one who asks, but according to the eternal purpose of the Father.

**24.** *were moved with indignation.*] The indignation of the ten, as well as the request of the two, was caused by the same desire of pre-eminence and jealousy of the claim of others. Our Lord rebukes this spirit as He had done before on a similar occasion (ch. xviii. 1), by shewing that humility, and not ambition, is the condition of greatness in His kingdom.

**28.** *a ransom for many.*] *I.e.* in the stead of, or in exchange for, many. The vicarious character of our Lord's death is here plainly declared. His life is the price by which mankind are redeemed from the dominion of sin and spiritual death. No stress can be laid here or at ch. xxvi. 28, on the term *many* as distinguished from *all;* nor need it be said that πολλῶν is used for πάντων. The language is in substance that of Isaiah liii. 12, where the contrast is merely between Christ as one and mankind as many, without any reference to a limit of the number.

**29.** *as they departed.*] The entrance into Jericho is not mentioned by St. Matthew, and the events in that city are omitted both by him and St. Mark. St. Luke supplies the omission by narrating the visit to Zacchæus and the parable of the Pounds.

30-34. MIRACLE AT JERICHO.

*from Jericho.*] Jericho was distant 150 stadia (nearly 17½ miles English) from Jerusalem, and 60 stadia (nearly 7 miles) from the Jordan (Josephus, 'B.J.,' iv. 8, § 3). The position of Jericho, some 17 miles N.E. of Jerusalem, is in accordance with the supposition that our Lord entered Judea from the side of Peræa. It is not in the direct line for a traveller journeying southward from Galilee through Samaria, but it is in the direct route for one crossing the Jordan from Peræa. Indeed, from its vicinity to the river, it would naturally be the first halting-place to a traveller coming by that way. (Cf. Ellicott, 'Hist. Lect.,' p. 122.)

**30.** *two blind men.*] St. Mark mentions only one blind man, Bartimæus, and agrees with St. Matthew in fixing the time of his cure at our Lord's departure from Jericho. St. Luke also mentions only one cure, but places it at the time of our Lord's entry into Jericho. The apparent discrepancy as regards the number of cures may possibly be explained in the same way as in the case of the two demoniacs. (See on ch. viii. 28.) The explanation of the difference respecting the time and place of the cure will depend on the question whether St. Mark's narrative relates to the same event as St. Luke's.

**34.** *and touched their eyes.*] This circumstance is omitted by the other Evangelists.

*and they followed him.*] At this point a

short break occurs in the narrative of the Synoptists which must be supplied from St. John. The former proceed at once from our Lord's departure from Jericho to His entrance into Jerusalem. The latter interposes the visit to Bethany (John xii. 1-11), which should be inserted here between this and the next chapter. Bethany was on the road from Jericho to Jerusalem, about 15 stadia, or nearly 1¾ English mile, from the latter (John xi. 18), and consequently about 135 stadia, or nearly 15½ miles, from the former. Our Lord arrived at Bethany six days before the Passover (John xii. 1), *i.e.* on the Sabbath preceding Palm Sunday. As the ordinary Sabbath day's journey was limited to 2000 cubits or about 6 furlongs English, it is probable that our Lord rested for the night after leaving Jericho, at some place near Bethany. The day of His leaving Jericho will thus be probably Friday, the day preceding the Sabbath.

## NOTE ON THE PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD.

Of this parable, Archbishop Trench has observed, that it "stands only second to that of the Unjust Steward in the number of explanations, and those the most widely different, that have been proposed for it; as it is also only second to that, if indeed second, in the difficulties which beset it." "There is," he continues, "first the difficulty of bringing it into harmony with the saying by which it is introduced and concluded, and which it is plainly intended to illustrate; and, secondly, there is the moral difficulty, the same as finds place in regard of the Elder Brother in the parable of the Prodigal Son—namely, how can one who is himself a member of the kingdom of God be held, as Chrysostom terms it, 'by that lowest of all passions, envy and an evil eye,' grudging in his heart the favour shown to other members of that kingdom? or, if it be denied that these murmurers and enviers *are* members of that kingdom, how is this denial reconcileable with the fact of their having laboured all day long in the vineyard, and ultimately carrying away their own reward? And, lastly, there is the difficulty of deciding what is the salient point of the parable, the main doctrine which we are to gather from it."

Yet, if the parable taken by itself is confessedly beset with difficulties, the context by which it is introduced is comparatively plain, and may assist us toward the interpretation of the parable by excluding such of the conflicting interpretations as cannot be brought into harmony with it. If we begin upon the principle that the more difficult must be interpreted by the less, the parable by the context, not the context by the parable, we may perhaps succeed in reducing the number of possible interpretations, if not in finally determining the true one.

The parable is introduced in close connection with the saying which concludes the previous chapter: "But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first;" and this again is introduced by the rewards which shall be given, first to the Apostles, and secondly to all those who had forsaken relatives and possessions for Christ's sake. The saying itself must clearly be interpreted subject to the conditions of the verses by which it is introduced. A supreme place in Christ's kingdom at His second coming is promised to the Apostles, and perhaps to others who may hereafter be admitted to an apostolic reward. Recompense even in this world, eternal life in the world to come, is promised to *all*[1] who have forsaken earthly ties and possessions for Christ's sake; and then comes the qualification: "But many that are first," &c. *Many* of whom? clearly of those just mentioned, to all of whom eternal life is promised. No mention is made of those who are finally rejected;[2] the distinction is not between those among professing Christians who are saved and those who are lost, but between different degrees of honour and reward among those who are all of them admitted to inherit everlasting life.

Indeed, the words themselves, apart from their context, seem naturally to imply the same thing. The idea of being *last* among a number is different from that of being wholly excluded from the number. First and *last* seem of themselves to imply a common inheritance, though in different proportions, or a

[1] It is indifferent to the argument whether we read *πᾶς ὃς* (everyone who) or *ὅστις* (whosoever). The meaning will be the same in both cases.

[2] It is only by going back to the earlier context and finding a reference to the young man who had just gone away sorrowful, that such a mention can be implied. But the reference is inadmissible, because this young man was not even a nominal follower of Christ, not even an outward member of the "kingdom of heaven." He was not of the number of the seeming servants of Christ who grow in the Church, as the tares with the wheat, until the harvest; he refused to enter into the Church at all upon the conditions proposed to him.

common service, though in different ranks; to hold the lowest place in a given body cannot, without great violence, be understood as equivalent to being excluded from the body altogether.[1]

These considerations will compel us to reject all interpretations which deny that the murmurers are members of the kingdom of God, and which see in the words, "take that thine is and go thy way," a sentence of final exclusion from the presence of the Lord. They also render almost, if not quite, certain the view held by the great majority of commentators, that by the denarius is meant the gift of eternal life, and consequently that all the labourers are represented as finally saved. If this point be once determined, the details of the parable almost explain themselves. The vineyard, an image under which the Lord, by the mouth of Isaiah, had described the Jewish Church under the old covenant, now, in like manner, represents the Christian Church upon earth—the Church, in her time of labour and trial, awaiting the second coming of her Lord. The Evening and the Payment of the Labourers represent the close of this dispensation, and the coming of Christ in judgment, to render to every man according to his deeds.

Against this explanation two apparent objections may at first sight be urged. First, it has been said that the denarius does not signify eternal life; for this cannot be represented as wages due for work, but as the free gift of God through Christ; and, moreover, to represent all who are finally saved as receiving an equal reward is not only contrary to the tenor of other passages of Scripture, but to the saying, "the last shall be first and the first last," which indicates, not an equality between the first and the last, but a reversal of their position. Secondly, it has been said that the murmuring labourers cannot be represented as finally admitted to Christ's heavenly kingdom, for in that kingdom discontent and envy can have no place. The former objection seems to be based on the error of supposing that a parable in illustration of any point of Christian doctrine must needs embrace the entire theology of the doctrine in question. The denarius is, indeed, represented in a certain sense as the reward of labour, not, however, on account of the inherent merits of that labour, but by virtue of an express covenant on the part of the owner of the vineyard. The performance of that covenant depends upon the labourer striving on his own part to fulfil its conditions; and this is surely a true, though not a complete representation of God's promise through Christ. What more is there in this part of the parable than in the direct teaching of St. Paul, "that God will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life"? (Rom. ii. 6, 7.) These words do not represent the whole teaching of St. Paul, neither does the parable represent the whole teaching of Christ. But the one and the other, though exhibiting a portion only of the revealed truth, contain nothing incompatible with the remainder. So, again, when the labourers are represented as receiving, "every man a penny," this need not be understood as representing the whole of God's dealings with His servants at the end of the world, as the labourers themselves need not be understood as representing the whole of the Christian Church. The main object of the parable is to shew that the longer labour does not necessarily establish a claim to the higher reward. God's gift is not a mere equivalent for service, to be calculated according to man's estimate of less or more. God may, without violation of His own perfect justice, place the latest labourer on a level with the earliest, and the earliest on a level with the latest; He may even (for this, if not expressed in the parable, is implied in the language of verse 15) give, if He sees fit, more to the last than to the first; for He sees the hearts of men and not merely their outward acts. He knows not merely the works which they have done, but the spirit in which they have done them, and the character which they have contributed to form. In this respect, as Archbishop Trench remarks, "the parable is a protest against the whole *quantitative* appreciation of men's works (the Romanist), as distinct from the

[1] Archbishop Trench remarks that "in the one other passage where the words occur (Luke xiii. 30) there can be no doubt that a total rejection of the first, the unbelieving Jews, accompanied with the receiving of the last, the Gentiles, with covenant, is there declared." Neander, in like manner, says ('Life of Christ,' p. 385, Eng. Tr.) the "last" (in Luke xiii. 30) are those who are wholly shut out from the kingdom of God. With all deference to these high authorities, I must confess to feeling considerable doubt as to the correctness of this interpretation. The rejection of the unbelieving and unrighteous, whether Jews or Gentiles, is concluded in verses 27, 28. Then comes (verse 29) the mention of those who are accepted from all nations alike: "And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. And behold [among those who thus sit down], there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last." It is surely more natural to interpret verse 31 in immediate connection with verse 29, than with the preceding verses.

*qualitative*, against all which would make the works the end and man the means, instead of the man the end and the works the means—against that scheme which, however unconsciously, lies at the root of so many of the confusions in our theology at this day." Degrees and differences no doubt there may be in the future state of Christ's redeemed; but these differences form no part of the general covenant of grace in which the one gift of eternal life is offered to all through the merits of our Saviour, still less under that covenant may any man presume to "suppose that he shall receive more." To all who are called there is but one hope of their calling, though to every one is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.

But we have still to consider the force of the second objection, How can those who are admitted to eternal life be represented at the very time of their admission as possessed with a spirit of murmuring against God, and envy of others who received the same reward? This objection again rests upon the assumption that the minutest portions of the imagery of a parable, down to the exact moment when each circumstance is represented as taking place, must find its exact parallel in the spiritual counterpart. In the imagery of the parable it is natural, and according to custom, that the wages should be paid at the close of the day, and the murmuring, taking place upon the payment, is appropriately assigned to the same time; indeed it could not be represented otherwise, for until the time of payment came, the first labourers did not know what their companions were to receive. But in the Christian Church the promises of God are made known beforehand to men during their earthly life, and the doubt or murmuring, if it arise at all, will arise at the same time, and have reference to the revealed promise, not to the accomplished fulfilment. It is while God's ways are still discerned in this present life "through a glass darkly," that even those who are earnestly striving to serve him with imperfect knowledge may at times be overcome by the temptation which would suggest, "the way of the Lord is not equal." The words are, in the first instance, a warning to the disciples in connection with the promise given to them—a warning that others, who had come later to the service of Christ, might attain to a place equal or even higher than their own—a warning against the desire for pre-eminence which they had themselves exhibited in their erroneous view of the nature of Christ's kingdom—a warning against indulging during this life a spirit such as the labourers are represented as indulging at the end of their task. As regards the general import of the parable, the following remarks of Dean Alford appear to me to contain the true view: "Its 'punctum saliens' is that the kingdom of God is of grace, not of debt; that they who were called first and have laboured longest have no more claim upon God than those who were called last, but that to all His covenant promise shall be fulfilled in its integrity. Its *primary application* is to the Apostles, who had asked the question. They were not to be of such a spirit as to imagine, with the murmurers, that they should have something pre-eminent (because they were called first and had laboured longest) above those who *in their own time* were to be afterwards called (see 1 Cor. xv. 8-11). Its *secondary application* is to all those to whom such a comparison of *first and last called* will apply: *nationally* to the Jews, who were first called, and with a definite covenant, and the Heathens, who came in afterwards, and on a covenant, though really made, yet not so open and prominent; *individually*, to those whose call has been in early life, and who have spent their days in God's active service, and those who have been summoned later, and to various other classes and persons between whom comparison, not only of *time*, but of advantages, talents, or any other distinguishing characteristic, can be made; that none of the first of these can boast themselves over the others, nor look for higher place and greater reward, inasmuch as there is but one 'gift' of God according to the covenant of grace."

There remains, however, one considerable difficulty in the concluding words of the whole, "for many be called, but few chosen." These words occur again at the conclusion of another parable (ch. xxii. 14); and in that passage the contrast is unquestionably between those members of the visible Church who are members in appearance only, and who are rejected at the last day, and those who are finally accepted. The words *called* and *chosen* (κλητοί, ἐκλεκτοί) do not in themselves imply any such distinction, and are sometimes used in Scripture with a different application. In Philipp. iii. 14 the *prize* is especially associated with the *calling* of God. In 2 Pet. i. 10 the apostle exhorts his readers to give all diligence to make their *calling and election* sure, as if the latter no less than the former might possibly be forfeited. In Rev. xvii. 14 they that are with the Lamb are spoken of as "*called and chosen* and faithful." In the two latter passages there seems but little difference between the two words. (See Hammond's elaborate notes on Matt. xx. 16; Pet. ii. 6; and Olshausen on Matt. xxii. 14.) In like manner, when it is said (Luke vi. 13) that our Lord called His disciples and *chose* (ἐκλεξάμενος) twelve of them, it is not implied that the remainder were rejected for being disciples, but only that they were not selected for the higher office of Apostles. There is an expressed contrast, it is true, in this place between *chose* and *called* (προσεφώνησε, which

merely implies a summons for that occasion), but a previous calling is implied in the fact of their being disciples. But to put such an interpretation upon the words in the present passage would be to do violence to the whole tenor of the parable itself and of the preceding context. From this difficulty there seem to be but two modes of escape. We may either interpret the words themselves as bearing a different meaning here from that of ch. xxii. 14—a meaning such as has been indicated in the note on ch. xx. 16; or, considering that the oldest MSS omit the words in the present place, they may possibly be regarded as a marginal gloss, which was originally appended by way of comment from ch. xxii. 14, and which subsequently found its way into the text. Either of these alternatives may be plausibly maintained; but, on the other hand, we should not be warranted in perverting the whole interpretation of the present parable, on account of a few words of doubtful authority which are appended to another parable with a meaning which is appropriate there, but which is forced and unnatural here. (The two oldest MSS, ℵ B, which omit this clause, are supported by L Z, and by the Coptic version, not, however, by Origen, who generally agrees with them. The two latest commentators, Reuss, 'Hist. évang.,' p. 534, and Weiss, M. E., p. 439, take the same view as Dean Mansel, and reject it as a gloss from Matt. xxii. 14. F. C. C.)

## CHAPTER XXI.

1 *Christ rideth into Jerusalem upon an ass,* 12 *driveth the buyers and sellers out of the temple,* 17 *curseth the fig-tree,* 23 *putteth to silence the priests and elders,* 28 *and rebuketh them by the similitude of the two sons,* 33 *and the husbandmen, who slew such as were sent unto them.*

[d] Mark 11. 1. Luke 19. 29.

AND [d] when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem, and were come to Bethphage, unto the mount of Olives, then sent Jesus two disciples,

2 Saying unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose *them*, and bring *them* unto me.

3 And if any *man* say ought unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them.

4 All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying,

CHAP. XXI.—1-11. OUR LORD'S ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

1. *And when they drew nigh.*] The time is fixed by the data furnished by St. John (xii. 1). Our Lord came to Bethany six days before the Passover, *i. e.* on the 8th Nisan, the reckoning being exclusive of the Passover-day itself, the 14th, but inclusive of the day of arrival. (See Greswell, 'Diss.,' vol. iii., p. 54, 2nd Ed.) If we regard Friday, the day of our Lord's Crucifixion, as the 14th, the 8th was the Sabbath, and the entry into Jerusalem, which took place the next day (John xii. 12), was on the 9th Nisan, the day now known as Palm Sunday. If we adopt the view that our Lord was crucified on the 15th, and, consequently, that the Passover fell on Thursday, the arrival at Bethany must be placed on the Friday, and we must suppose (with Wieseler, 'Chr. Syn.,' p. 358, Eng. Tr.) that our Lord remained at Bethany over the Sabbath, and entered Jerusalem on Sunday the 10th Nisan. Both theories agree in assigning the entry into Jerusalem to Palm Sunday, though differing as to the day of the month: but in the latter case we must suppose a day to intervene between the entry into Bethany (John xii. 1) and the supper (verse 2), of which there is no hint in St. John's narrative.

*Bethphage.*] *I. e.* the house of figs—a place, probably a village, on the Mount of Olives, apparently close to Bethany, the two being mentioned together: Mark xi. 1; Luke xix. 29. See further on Mark. No trace of it now exists.

Bethphage is mentioned in the Talmud as the region bordering Jerusalem (see Rosenmüller on this place), from which we may conclude that it was nearer to Jerusalem than Bethany; which agrees with St. John's statement that our Lord came to Jerusalem from Bethany. Robinson, however ('Researches,' vol. ii. p. 103) places it to the east of Bethany, which he thinks may be inferred by comparing the present passage with Luke xix. 29. The inference, however, is not necessary. (See note on Mark xi. 1. F. C. C.)

2. *an ass tied, and a colt.*] The other Evangelists mention the colt only, as being the one on which our Lord rode, the mother probably accompanying it, "apparently after the manner of a sumpter, as prophets so riding would be usually accompanied, but not of course doing the work of a sumpter." (Alford.)

4. *that it might be fulfilled.*] We learn

e Isai. 62. 11. Zech. 9. 9. John 12. 15.

5 e Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.

f Mark 11. 4.

6 f And the disciples went, and did as Jesus commanded them,

7 And brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they set *him* thereon.

8 And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down branches from the trees, and strawed *them* in the way.

9 And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest.

g Mark 11. 15. Luke 19. 45. John 2. 13.

10 g And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this?

11 And the multitude said, This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee.

12 ¶ And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves,

---

from John xii. 16 that the disciples did not at the time understand the meaning of this action, but recognised the fulfilment of the prophecy after the Ascension of Christ.

*by the prophet.*] The name of the prophet is not mentioned, the quotation being in fact a combination of two prophecies (Isai. lxii. 11; Zech. ix. 9), both announcing the coming of the Saviour to Jerusalem, and both fulfilled on this occasion. The words of Isaiah are in fact a general prediction of that which is repeated in Zechariah with more exact detail.

**5.** *Behold, thy king cometh, &c.*] These words are cited in a form differing from the LXX version sufficiently to shew that they are not taken from it. There is no ground in St. Matthew's language for the supposition of Strauss and De Wette, to which even Neander assents, that the mention of the two animals arises from a misapprehension of the meaning of the conjunction either in the Hebrew, or in the LXX. The conjunction *and* occurs in the LXX as well as in the gospel, and if it is understood as exegetical in the one, it may be equally so understood in the other. If we suppose that the two animals were invented by the Evangelist, or by his original authority, to agree with a misinterpretation of the prophecy, we must also suppose that the same authority intended to represent our Lord as riding on both together, a supposition which needs no other refutation than its own obvious absurdity. The question reduces itself to one of two alternatives: Is it more natural to suppose that the Evangelist seriously conceived so glaring an absurdity; or that he mentioned the presence of the mother because she actually accompanied the colt, thereby giving a more complete narrative than the other Evangelists, though one in no way opposed to theirs?

**7.** *put on them their clothes.*] The disciples seem to have been uncertain which of the animals Jesus intended to ride, and therefore placed the clothes on both. (Meyer.)

*they set him thereon.*] Literally "and they set him on them;" or, according to another and probably more accurate reading, "and he sat on them." The words *on them* will be most naturally interpreted of the garments, not of the animals. (See Winer, 'Gram.,' § 27, p. 189, Eng. Tr.) The latter application has been defended by reference to a similar expression, Acts xxiii. 24—"Provide beasts, that they may set Paul on;" but the parallelism in the original is not exact, and it seems simpler and more consonant with the construction of the passage to adopt the other interpretation.

**8.** *spread their garments.*] As in honour of a king. (Cf. 2 Kings ix. 13.)

**9.** *Hosanna.*] A Hebrew expression, from Psalm cxviii. 25, where it is rendered "save now." In its present use it is usually interpreted as a form rather of salutation than of supplication, equivalent to "Hail," or "God save;" (literally, "Salvation to the Son of David"). If, as is probable, we understand St. Luke's equivalent, "peace in heaven and glory in the highest," as a paraphrase of the Hebrew expression intended to convey its general meaning to Gentile readers, we may understand it as combining a prayer for blessing on and through Jesus, together with an ascription of glory to God, from whom the blessing is to come.

*in the highest.*] St. Luke ii. 14, "Glory to God in the highest," *i.e.* in the highest heavens. Compare Ps. xciii. (xcii.) 4, LXX, where ἐν ὑψηλοῖς is used by the LXX for the Hebrew במרום, "in the height," *i.e.* in heaven. Here it is equivalent to a prayer that the salutation may be ratified in heaven.

12-16. THE TEMPLE VISITED.

**12.** *went into the temple.*] According to

13 And said unto them, It is written, [h] My house shall be called the house of prayer; [i] but ye have made it a den of thieves.

h Isai. 56. 7. i Jer. 7. 11. Mark 11. 17. Luke 19. 46

14 And the blind and the lame came to him in the temple; and he healed them.

15 And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the son of David; they were sore displeased,

16 And said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus saith unto them, Yea; have ye never read, [k] Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?

k Ps. 8. 2.

17 ¶ And he left them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and he lodged there.

18 Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered.

19 [l] And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the fig tree withered away.

l Mark 11. 13.

---

St. Mark, our Lord on this day merely went into the Temple, and looked round upon all things, and retired in the evening to Bethany, the purification of the temple being postponed to the next day. (See note on Mark xi. 11.) This is probably the more exact account. St. Matthew, following his usual method of local or circumstantial, rather than temporal association, narrates the whole of what took place in the Temple in a single narrative, without noticing the division of days. St. Luke mentions the purification of the Temple immediately after narrating our Lord's entry into the city, but without expressly marking the time. It is admitted by the majority of commentators of all schools that this cleansing of the Temple is distinct from that which occurred at the beginning of our Lord's ministry (John ii. 13-15). The latter is omitted by the Synoptists, who record only the Galilean portion of the early ministry. Some harmonists (Gresswell, Ebrard, Krafft) regard as the concluding event of this day the request of the Greeks who had come to the feast, and our Lord's reply (John xii. 20-36). This event may probably have taken place in the court of the Gentiles at the Temple, which was also the seat of the money-changers, and there is no improbability in assigning it to this day. But Wieseler and Tischendorf prefer to place it two days later, on the evening of the Tuesday in this week, which also is chiefly occupied with events which took place in the Temple. And this latter seems on the whole the preferable arrangement. (See on ch. xxiv. 1.)

*them that sold.*] We have no trace (as Alford observes) of this market in the Old Testament. It appears to have first arisen after the captivity, when many would come from foreign lands to Jerusalem. The office of the money-changers was to exchange foreign coins for the half-shekel of the sanctuary, which was due at the end of every year, *i.e.* just before the present time. (See on ch. xvii. 24, and Lightfoot on this place.) The doves were sold for offerings, chiefly of the poor, on various occasions (see Levit. v. 7, xii. 8, xiv. 22, xv. 14, 29; Numb. vi. 10; Luke ii. 24); but it appears from John ii. 14 that oxen and sheep for the greater sacrifices were also sold in the same place. (See note on Mark xi. 15. F. C. C.)

13. *And said unto them, &c.*] Our Lord here refers to two passages of the Old Testament: Isai. lvi. 7; Jer. vii. 11. The latter, uttered by the prophet as a denunciation of the crimes of the Jews at the time of the captivity, and the consequent profanation of the temple, is now applied to another kind of profanation, the making of gain by unholy traffic.

*ye have made it.*] Or, *ye make it.* So ℵ B, and late editors. The Authorised Version is well supported. F. C. C.

16. *thou hast perfected praise.*] Our Lord cites from the LXX version of Psalm viii. 2. The Hebrew is rendered in the Authorised Version, *thou hast ordained strength.*

17. *went out . . . . into Bethany.*] *I.e.* returned to Bethany from whence He had come in the morning. (See John xii. 1, 12.) Bethany was a village about 15 stadia or 1¾ English mile from Jerusalem. (See on ch. xx. 34.)

18-22. THE BARREN FIG-TREE.

18. *in the morning.*] *I.e.* on Monday the 10th.

19. *a fig tree.*] Literally, as in the margin, *one fig-tree*, *i.e.* a single tree standing by itself. Fig-trees were probably numerous in this region, as is indicated by the name Bethphage. St. Mark agrees with St. Matthew in placing this occurrence on the second (*i.e.* the Monday) morning, and places it before the purification of the Temple, which is probably the more exact order. (See on verse 12.) His

20 And when the disciples saw *it*, they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig tree withered away!

21 Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do this *which is done* to the fig tree, but also if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; it shall be done.

22 And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.

23 ¶ [m] And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?

[m] Mark 11. 27. Luke 20. 1.

24 And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things.

25 The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him?

26 But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; [n] for all hold John as a prophet.

[n] ch. 14. 5.

27 And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

28 ¶ But what think ye? A *certain* man had two sons; and he came

---

account is also more circumstantial than St. Matthew's, and contains a difficulty in detail which will be noticed in its proper place. (See on Mark xi. 13.)

*presently.*] This is not inconsistent with St. Mark, who only says that the withering of the tree was not seen by the disciples till the following day. The only difference between the two accounts is that St. Matthew, as before with regard to the cleansing of the Temple, completes the whole narrative at once, by adding the remark of the disciples and our Lord's reply; while St. Mark, with a more exact notice of time, postpones these to the following day, on which they actually took place. The narrative from this point to the end of ch. xxv. belongs to the 3rd day of the week, Tuesday the 11th or 12th Nisan.

**20.** *the disciples.*] Probably St. Peter, representing the disciples. (See Mark xi. 21.)

**21.** *Jesus answered, &c.*] When we remember the parable of the barren fig-tree (Luke xiii. 6-9), we can hardly doubt that the present miracle is intended to bear a similar symbolical meaning, and to point in the first instance to the approaching destruction of the nation who were about to crucify their Messiah, and, secondly, to the punishment which will come upon all individuals as well as nations who neglect the grace offered to them, and bear no fruit in good works. (See verse 43, and cf. ch. iii. 10; John xv. 2, 6.) On the present occasion, however, our Lord dwells directly, not on the want of faith in Him which would be so severely punished, but on the power of faith in those who really possessed it. At the same time the words, like the similar ones at ch. xvii. 20, probably contain an indirect rebuke to the disciples of the imperfectness of their own faith, and a warning not to think too highly of themselves, as exempted from the sentence pronounced on their countrymen, but to cherish a spirit of humility in themselves and charity towards others. This more fully appears in the concluding words reported in Mark xi. 25, 26, which are omitted by St. Matthew. (See also note on ch. xvii. 20.)

23-32.—QUESTION OF AUTHORITY.

**23.** *the chief priests and the elders.*] *I.e.* the Sanhedrim. St. Mark and St. Luke add the Scribes. The questioners were an official deputation from the council, sent to inquire into our Lord's authority as a teacher, as they had previously done in the case of John the Baptist (John i. 19). They were sent in consequence of a previous deliberation held to consider how they might destroy Him. (See Luke xix. 47.) (Alford.)

**25.** *The baptism of John.*] *I.e.* his whole mission, of which his baptism was the principal feature. John had expressly borne witness to Jesus as the Mightier One who should come after him. His testimony, therefore, if of God, was conclusive evidence of the divine authority of Jesus. The appropriateness of the answer is still more evident, when we remember that the same Sanhedrim had sent messengers to inquire into the authority of John.

**28.** *A certain man, &c.*] The meaning of this parable is declared by our Lord Himself

to the first, and said, Son, go work to day in my vineyard.

29 He answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented, and went.

30 And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I *go*, sir: and went not.

31 Whether of them twain did the will of *his* father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.

32 [a]For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen *it*, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him.

33 ¶ Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, [b]which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country:

[a] ch. 3. 1.
[b] Isai. 5. 1. Jer. 2. 21. Mark 12. 1. Luke 20. 9.

---

(verse 31). The comparison is not between the Jews and the Gentiles, but between two classes of persons among the Jews—the notorious sinners, who, having lived in open disobedience to God's commands, repented at the preaching of John; and the self-righteous rulers of the people, who "say and do not." The parable contains an indirect answer to the previous question, acknowledging the divine authority of John's preaching, and the sin of those who refused to listen to it.

31. *The first.*] Following *one* MS, B, some editors read *the latter*. The received text has the support of old MSS and versions; but the reading was questioned in early times. Alford and Tischendorf agree with the Authorised Version. F. C. C.

*go into the kingdom of God.*] John had preached repentance, because the kingdom of heaven was at hand. Those who obeyed the call to repentance had shewn themselves fitter for that kingdom than those who neglected it. At the same time, in the words *go before you*, it is implied that the way is still open for others to follow if they will repent likewise.

32. *in the way of righteousness.*] *I.e.* as preaching and practising that very righteousness of the law which you yourselves acknowledge, yet ye refused to comply with acknowledged obligations. Our Lord had on a former occasion contrasted the reception of John by the publicans with that by the Pharisees (Luke vii. 29, 30).

33-46. Parable of the Vineyard.

33. *Hear another parable.*] This parable relates to the same subject as the former, but takes a wider range and a later phase of the history. The former shews how individually He was received by publicans and harlots, but rejected by the rulers and teachers of the people. The present shews how nationally He would be rejected, and even put to death, by the Jews, and the punishment which would follow upon the nation.

*a vineyard.*] The image is the same as that of Isaiah (verses 1-7), which is explained in the words "the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel." But whereas in Isaiah it is the vineyard itself that brought forth wild grapes, here it is the cultivators of the vineyard who refuse to give their lord the fruits of it. Here then we must interpret the vineyard as meaning the covenant and spiritual privileges entrusted to the Jewish people, while the people themselves, and their abuse of these privileges, are represented by the husbandmen.

The more usual interpretation may be given in the words of Archbishop Trench ('Parables,' xi.), who says, "Since the husbandmen must be different from the vineyard which they were to cultivate, they can be no other than the spiritual leaders and teachers of the people, while the vineyard itself will then naturally signify the great body of the people who were to be instructed and taught." This interpretation more nearly preserves the meaning of the figure in Isaiah, but hardly agrees so well with verse 43, where the husbandmen seem to mean the Jewish nation, as contrasted with the nation (ἔθνος, the word commonly used of the Gentiles) to whom the vineyard should be given.

*a winepress .... a tower.*] (See Isai. v. 2.) For the winepress (ληνός) St. Mark substitutes the place under the winepress (ὑπολήνιον), *i. e.* the vat or receptacle into which the juice flowed from the press; to the latter the word *digged* would more properly apply, but the two were in fact part of the same apparatus, and either implies the other. The *tower* was probably a place for watchmen to protect the vineyard from depredators.

*let it out to husbandmen.*] These husbandmen appear to have been tenants, who had to pay their rent, not in money, but in a certain

34 And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it.

35 And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another.

36 Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise.

37 But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son.

38 But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; [a]come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance.

[a] ch. 26. 3. John 11. 53.

39 And they caught him, and cast *him* out of the vineyard, and slew *him*.

40 When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?

41 They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out *his* vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.

---

portion of the produce. This is expressed in the language of St. Mark, and St. Luke, who say *of the fruit*, *i. e.* his portion of the fruit.

*went into a far country.*] St. Luke adds, *for a long time.* "At Sinai, when the theocratic constitution was founded, and in the miracles which accompanied the deliverance from Egypt and the bringing into Canaan, the Lord may be said to have openly manifested Himself to Israel; but then to have withdrawn Himself again for a while, not speaking to the people again face to face (Deut. xxxiv. 10-12), but waiting in patience to see what the law would effect." (Abp. Trench.)

**34.** *the fruits of it.*] These words may also be rendered "his fruits," *i. e.* the portion of fruit due to him as owner of the vineyard.

**35.** *And the husbandmen took his servants, &c.*] Abp. Trench cites, as an admirable commentary on this passage, the confession made by the Levites (Neh. ch. ix.), especially the words (verse 26) "Nevertheless they were disobedient, and rebelled against thee, and cast thy law behind their backs, and slew thy prophets which testified against them to turn them to thee, and they wrought great persecutions." For the treatment of the prophets at different periods of the Jewish history, see 1 Kings xviii. 4, xxii. 24-27; 2 Chron. xxiv. 21; Jer. xxvi. 20-23, xxxvii. 15. See also Hebr. xi. 36, 37.

**37.** *his son.*] Our Lord now proceeds from history to prophecy; from the past conduct of the Jewish people towards the prophets whom God from time to time had sent to them, to that which they were about to manifest towards Himself, the Son. The Son, here and still more clearly in Mark xii. 6, is distinguished from the servants, as in Hebr. iii. 5, 6 Christ is distinguished from Moses.

**38.** *come, let us kill him.*] "The very words (in the original Greek) of the LXX version of Gen. xxxvii. 20, where Joseph's brethren express a similar resolution, and no doubt used by the Lord in reference to that history, so deeply typical of His rejection and exaltation. This resolution had already been taken; see John xi. 47-53." (Alford.)

**39.** *cast him out of the vineyard.*] "All three narrators describe the Son as thus 'cast out of the vineyard,' by which we are reminded of Him who "suffered without the gate." (Hebr. xiii. 12, 13; John xix. 17.) (Trench.) St. Mark, indeed, inverts the order, "they took him and killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard," which, however, may merely mean that they cast down the body on the spot where it was slain.

**40.** *When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh.*] The whole tenor of the parable points to the temporal punishment of the Jewish nation as a nation, and the transference of God's covenant to the Gentiles. The *coming of the Lord* must in this place be interpreted of the destruction of Jerusalem, not of His second coming to judge all men individually.

**41.** *They say unto him.*] From St. Luke we learn that this parable was spoken to the people, though in the hearing of the chief priests and Scribes. The words which follow may have been uttered by some of the people, who might not see so clearly as the priests and Scribes the self-condemnation involved in them. This seems more probable than that the priests and Scribes themselves missed, or pretended to miss, the sense of the parable. The words added by St. Luke, "God forbid," may have been uttered by others among the people or the rulers, who saw more clearly the meaning of the parable. In St. Mark and St. Luke the latter part of the parable is narrated in an abbreviated form, the contents of verses 41, 42 being given continuously, without noticing the distinction of speakers.

42 Jesus saith unto them, [b] Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?

[b] Ps. 118. 22. Acts 4. 11.

43 Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.

44 And whosoever [c] shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

[c] Isai. 8. 14. Rom. 9. 33. 1 Pet. 2. 7.

45 And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them.

46 But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet.

## CHAPTER XXII.

*1 The parable of the marriage of the king's son. 9 The vocation of the Gentiles. 12 The punishment of him that wanted the wedding garment. 15 Tribute ought to be paid to Cæsar. 23 Christ confuteth the Sadducees for the resurrection: 34 answereth the lawyer, which is the first and great commandment: 41 and poseth the Pharisees about the Messias.*

AND Jesus answered [d] and spake unto them again by parables, and said,

[d] Luke 14. 16. Rev. 19. 9

2 The kingdom of heaven is like

---

42. *The stone, &c.*] The original is an exact quotation from the LXX version of Psa. cxviii. 22. The Messianic prediction of this Psalm is more fully explained in the language of St. Peter (Acts iv. 11; see also 1 Pet. ii. 7).

43. *The kingdom of God.*] This expression still retains its general meaning of God's Church upon earth, but is here used rather in the abstract, as implying the spiritual privileges implied in the idea of that Church, than, as more usual, in the concrete for the body of its members. The privileges belonging to the chosen people of God (cf. Romans ix. 4) are to be taken from the children of Abraham according to the flesh, and given to them who are his children in faith.

44. *whosoever shall fall on this stone.*] An application of Isaiah viii. 15, when it should be observed that the antecedent, represented under the image of a stone of stumbling, is the Lord of Hosts. "They fall on the stone, who are offended at Christ in His low estate (Isai. viii. 4; Luke ii. 34). Of this sin His hearers were already guilty. There was yet a worse sin which they were on the point of committing, which He warns them would be followed by a more tremendous punishment; they on whom the stone falls are those who set themselves in distinct and self-conscious opposition against the Lord; who, knowing who He is, do yet to the end oppose themselves to Him and to His kingdom." (Abp. Trench.)

*it will grind him to powder.*] Literally, "it will winnow him." The word is derived from the winnowing-fan, by which the chaff, when separated from the wheat, and crushed into fragments, is driven away before the wind. The word here seems rather to imply the previous crushing, the proper action of the stone. The image is taken from Dan. ii. 35, where the stone, made without hands, representing the kingdom of Christ, is represented as crushing the previous kingdoms till they "became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, and the wind carried them away." The word used in this place (*λικμήσει*) is adopted in Theodotion's version of Dan. ii. 44 (*λεπτυνεῖ καὶ λικμήσει πάσας τὰς βασιλείας*), in the place of the LXX rendering, *πατάξει καὶ ἀφανίσει.*

(The whole of this verse is omitted by some late editors; but it is found in all the old MSS but one, D, and in all ancient versions, except in some copies of the old Italic, which often agree with D in doubtful readings. F. C. C.)

### CHAP. XXII.—1-14. PARABLE OF THE MARRIAGE FEAST.

1. *And Jesus answered, &c.*] This occurred after a brief interval, during which the chief priests and Pharisees gave some indication of their designs against our Lord. As a last warning to them, He now proceeds to a third parable, similar in import to the last, but exhibiting God's relation to His chosen people under a more gracious image, no longer as a duty exacted by a householder from his labourers, but as an invitation to a feast issued by a king to his subjects. This parable of the marriage of the King's Son, though regarded by some commentators, as Maldonatus, as identical with the similar one of the Great Supper (Luke xiv. 16-24), seems clearly distinct from it; the two differ in the time of their delivery. The present parable was spoken in the Temple, at the end of our Lord's ministry, when the Pharisees had resolved on His de-

unto a certain king, which made a marriage for his son,

3 And sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding: and they would not come.

4 Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and *my* fatlings *are* killed, and all things *are* ready: come unto the marriage.

5 But they made light of *it*, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise:

6 And the remnant took his servants, and entreated *them* spitefully, and slew *them*.

7 But when the king heard *thereof*, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city.

8 Then saith he to his servants,

---

struction; the other was spoken at an earlier period, when the enmity of the Pharisees was not yet declared, and at a meal in the house of one of the chiefs of the body. The details are different: in the one the banquet is given by a king, in the other by a private person, and the conduct and treatment of the guests first invited is different likewise. The spiritual meaning of the two is also different: the present parable, like the one preceding it, points to the punishment of the Jews, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the call of the Gentiles; in the other, there is little if any allusion to a national judgment, but chiefly, if not entirely, to the acceptance or rejection of individuals. (See further, Trench on the Parables, xii. and xxi.)

**2.** *a certain king, &c.*] The subordinate features of this parable have a clear religious significance, the King representing God the Father, while the marriage of the Son signifies the union of Christ with His Church. (Cf. Eph. v. 23; Rev. xix. 7-9, xxi. 2, 9.) It has been remarked, as an instance of the inadequacy of things human to set forth things divine, that the members of the Church are at once the guests invited to the feast, and, in their collective capacity, constitute the bride at whose espousal the feast is given. But this is hardly the case. In this, as in the previous parable of the wicked husbandmen, the ideal Church as an institution is distinguished from the visible Church as the body of believers. The bride, as united with the Son, represents in the first instance the scheme of redemption and spiritual privileges through Christ which are implied in the idea of the Christian Church, apart from the consideration of the individuals who avail themselves of the offered blessings. The rejection or acceptance of the offer is typified in the later part of the parable by the conduct of the guests. In like manner, in Rev. xxi. 23, 24, the holy city, the Lamb's wife, is distinguished from the nations of the saved who walk in her light.

**3.** *his servants.*] The servants of ch. xxi. 34 are the prophets under the old dispensation. Here, however, the invitation is to the actual kingdom of Christ, and the servants must be understood rather as meaning the Apostles who preached Christ first during His life upon earth, and secondly after His ascension. The guests (the Jews) had been previously "bidden" by the Law, which was given as a schoolmaster, to bring them to Christ, and by the Prophets, who all gave witness to Him. At length the Forerunner and the Apostles of Christ were sent when the time of the kingdom was come.

*them that were bidden.*] τοὺς κεκλημένους, *i.e.* those who had previously been bidden, and were now summoned again. "This second invitation," says Abp. Trench, "is quite according to Eastern manners. Thus Esther invites Haman to a banquet on the morrow (Esth. v. 8), and when the time has actually arrived, the chamberlain comes to bring him to the banquet (vi. 14). Modern travellers testify to the same custom now of repeating the invitation to a great entertainment at the moment when all things are in actual readiness."

**4.** *other servants.*] This may refer to the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews after our Lord's ascension, when other preachers (Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, Paul) were added to the number of Christ's servants.

**6.** *took his servants.*] *I.e.* laid violent hands on them, as the rulers of the Jews did on the Apostles (Acts iv. 3, v. 18).

*entreated them spitefully.*] See Acts v. 40, xiv. 19, xvii. 5, xxi. 30, xxiii. 2.

*slew them.*] See Acts vii. 58, xii. 2.

**7.** *sent forth his armies.*] The Romans who destroyed Jerusalem were instruments in the hand of God, even as the Assyrian was the rod of His anger (Isai. x. 5), and Nebuchadnezzar His servant (Jer. xxv. 9).

**8.** *Then saith he.*] The order of the parable is not quite that of the subsequent history, for the call of the Gentiles was before the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet that destruction had already been determined by God, and the events leading to it were in the course

The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy.

9 Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage.

10 So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good: and the wedding was furnished with guests.

11 ¶ And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment:

12 And he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless.

13 Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast *him* into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

14 [e] For many are called, but few *are* chosen.

15 ¶ [f] Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in *his* talk.

16 And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God

[e] ch. 20. 16.
[f] Mark 12. 13. Luke 20. 20.

---

of accomplishment. The great sacrifice had already taken place which was to cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease and lead to the consummation (Dan. ix. 27).

*were not worthy.*] The same language is applied by St. Paul to the Jews who rejected his preaching: "Seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles" (Acts xiii. 46).

**9.** *highways.*] Literally, "the outlets of the ways," *i. e.* the points where different ways meet, and where there would be the largest concourse of people. It is wrong to suppose with some recent interpreters that country roads are especially intended, the city having been destroyed. The city here intended, as Alford rightly remarks, is not that of the murderers, but that of the King, *i. e.* the whole world as subject to God.

**10.** *both bad and good.*] These words admit of two interpretations: they may mean, as in the parables of the Tares and the Draw-Net, that in the visible Church the evil will be mingled with the good until the final separation at the end of the world; or they may mean that redemption through Christ is offered to all who will accept it, without distinction of persons. In the one case the bad remain bad after their call; in the other, they repent and are converted. Probably both meanings are included, the former being more distinctly brought out at the end of the parable.

**11.** *a man.*] Probably no stress should be laid on the circumstance that only one man is mentioned. Verse 14 seems to imply that many are rejected; and if the image, as is not improbable, is taken from Zeph. i. 7, 8, we find there the punishment predicted of *all such as are clothed with strange apparel.* But the mention of one only makes a personal appeal to the conscience of each individual, and is perhaps more consistent with the imagery of the parable in which the expulsion of many would imply a disturbance of the feast. (See Trench on the Parables, p. 231, 8th edition.)

*a wedding garment.*] It is not necessary to raise the question how the man was to have procured the garment. We may perhaps suppose that the king had provided garments for all his guests, and the authorities cited by Trench on this parable are sufficient to shew that such a custom may have existed at this time, though hardly to prove certainly that it did exist. The parable implies that it was the man's duty to provide himself with a proper garment, and that there were means of doing so, though it does not state what those means were. Nor is it necessary to discuss the controverted question whether the wedding-garment in its spiritual meaning is to be understood as faith or charity, or any one Christian grace in particular. The language used by St. Paul, to "put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27), to "put on the new man" (Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10), points not so much to one single quality, as to that regeneration, externally by baptism (Gal. iii. 27), internally by the Holy Spirit, without which our Lord elsewhere says that a man cannot enter into the kingdom of God. (John iii. v. Cf. Rev. xix. 8; Isai. lxi. 10.)

**13.** *the servants.*] διάκονοι, "ministers," not as in verses 3, 4, δοῦλοι. By these ministers are to be understood, as by the reapers in ch. xiii. 39, the angels.

**14.** *For many are called, &c.*] See note at the end of ch. xx.

### 16-22. THE TRIBUTE MONEY.

**16.** *the Herodians.*] On the religious position of the Herodians, see on ch. xvi. 6. Their

in truth, neither carest thou for any *man:* for thou regardest not the person of men.

17 Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?

18 But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, *ye* hypocrites?

19 Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a [1]penny.

20 And he saith unto them, Whose *is* this image and [1]superscription?

21 They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, [g]Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's.

22 When they had heard *these*

[1] *In value sevenpence half-penny:* ch. 20. 2.
[1] Or, *inscription.*
[g] Rom. 13. 7.

---

political position, and consequent relation to the Pharisees in the present case, has been variously explained. According to the common opinion (which, however, is put forth by Origen only as a conjecture) the Herodians, as supporters of the family of Herod, who held their dominions by the grant of the Roman emperor, would be in favour of paying tribute to the supreme power, while the Pharisees, as the rigid supporters of the law and the theocracy, and the enemies, as appears from Josephus ('Ant.,' xvii. 2, 4) of the Herodian dynasty, would be opposed to it. On this supposition, an affirmative answer to the question would give the latter a handle for accusing our Lord to the people as One who could not be their expected deliverer from a foreign yoke; while a negative answer would give an opportunity to the former of accusing Him before the Roman governor. But it may be doubted whether the above conjecture respecting the Herodians is correct. According to some critics, the name may be better explained by supposing them to have been supporters of the Herodian family as the last hope of retaining for the Jews a fragment of national government as distinguished from absolute dependence upon Rome as a province of the empire. This view is advanced by Grotius, and supported by Meyer on this place, and by Ewald, 'Die drei ersten Evangelien,' p. 196. According to this supposition, the Pharisees and the Herodians, however differing in other respects, were united in antagonism to the absolute dominion of Rome. Whichever hypothesis may be adopted, we learn from St. Luke (xx. 20) that their object was to take hold of our Lord's words that they might deliver Him up to the Roman governor; and the statement of the same Evangelist that they "feigned themselves just men," seems to imply that they assumed a false character for this purpose. Such a deception might be more easily attempted if we suppose that both parties were ostensibly opponents of the Roman rule, though covertly acting in this instance in support of it.

**17.** *Is it lawful to give tribute, &c.*] This question had been previously raised by Judas of Galilee, who had denied the lawfulness of paying tribute to the Roman emperor, on the ground that God was the only ruler of the Jewish people, and whose followers continued to maintain the same view. (See Josephus, 'Ant.,' xviii. 1, §§ 1, 6; 'B. J.,' ii. 8, § 1.) The question thus naturally implied a contrast between the authority of Cæsar and that of God, to which our Lord's answer refers.

**19.** *a penny.*] A denarius. (See on ch. xviii. 28.)

**20.** *this image and superscription.*] By accepting the coinage of the emperor, they in fact acknowledged his authority and right to tribute. The teaching of the later Jewish Rabbis, that "Wheresoever the money of any king is current, there the inhabitants acknowledge that king for their lord" (see Lightfoot in this place), may possibly have been in existence at this time. This would give additional force to the answer, which, however, rests on a principle sufficiently obvious without it.

**21.** *Render therefore, &c.*] Our Lord defeats the designs of His enemies by appealing to their own admission. By accepting the coinage of Cæsar, they had themselves acknowledged his supremacy in temporal things, and consequently his claim to tribute. But the answer goes further. The followers of Judas of Galilee regarded the authority of Cæsar as incompatible with that of God. Our Lord distinguishes between temporal and spiritual sovereignty, and shews that the two are not opposed to each other. God was no longer, as of old, the civil ruler of His people. They had rejected His authority, and He had given them over to a foreign power, who reigned and claimed tribute by His ordinance. (Cf. Rom. xiii. 1, 7.) But God was still, and must ever be, the spiritual Ruler of the world, and to Him now as ever worship and obedience were due. It was a striking comment on this answer when, three days afterwards, Christ declared before Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," and the chief priests, in demanding His death, declared, "We have no king but Cæsar." The interpretation of those commentators who understand by the

*words*, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.

[h Mark 12. 18. Luke 20. 27. i Acts 23. 8 k Deut. 25. 5.]

23 ¶ [h]The same day came to him the Sadducees, [i]which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him,

24 Saying, Master, [k]Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.

25 Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother:

26 Likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh.

27 And last of all the woman died also.

28 Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her.

29 Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.

30 For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.

---

"things that are God's" the tribute for the service of the Temple (ch. xvii. 24), seems altogether inadequate.

23-33. QUESTION CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION.

**23.** *the Sadducees.*] See on ch. iii. 7. The word *resurrection*, in reference to the tenets of the Sadducees, must not be understood merely of the resurrection of the body. The Sadducees, rejected the Pharisaic belief in an oral revelation through Moses, and recognised only the written books of the Pentateuch as emanating from their great Lawgiver. But these books contained, as they believed, no distinct intimation of a future state of reward and punishment, with or without a bodily resurrection, or even of the immortality of the soul. (Cf. Josephus, 'B. J.,' ii. 8, 14.) Believing that a doctrine so momentous could not, had it been true, have been omitted by Moses on all the occasions on which it might naturally have been urged, the Sadducees seem, not indeed to have rejected the later Scriptures, but to have at least explained away the passages in them which were opposed to their belief. The Pharisees, on the contrary, seem to have believed in a bodily resurrection and a future life, much in the Christian sense (Acts xxiii. 6-8), though they corrupted their belief by carnal conceptions of the future state. Our Lord's reply to the Sadducees aims rather at the root of their error than at its offshoot. He shews that even Moses, rightly understood, teaches the doctrine of immortal life, and thus destroys the assumption on which the Sadducees based their denial of the resurrection.

*the Sadducees, which say.*] All uncial and nearly all cursive MSS, and, with one unimportant exception, the ancient versions omit *the*. Instead of *which say* (οἱ λέγοντες), the two oldest and a few other MSS have *saying;* this would imply that these Sadducees came at the time openly denying the resurrection; but the received text is supported by a large number of good MSS, and by ancient versions, including the Memphitic and Sahidic. It unquestionably agrees with the statements of the two other Synoptists, and is in itself more satisfactory. In all these cases it should be borne in mind that the recension to which ℵ and B belong is conspicuous for omissions. F. C. C.

**24.** *Moses said.*] The substance, but not the language, of Deut. xxv. 5 is here given.

**25.** *seven brethren.*] It is not necessary to suppose that this was a true narrative. The Sadducees possibly, in order to ridicule the doctrine of the resurrection, invented an extreme though possible case. But the supposed difficulty would have been the same had two brethren only been mentioned.

**28.** *whose wife shall she be.*] Schoettgen cites from the cabbalistic book 'Sohar' an opinion of the Jewish doctors, that a woman who has been twice married shall return to her first husband in the next world. The date of this book, however, is too uncertain to make it a trustworthy authority for the opinions of the Pharisees of our Lord's day. Other and better authorities cited by the same writer indicate far more spiritual conceptions of the future life. Such is the following, from the Talmudic tract 'Berachoth,' fol. 17, 1:—"In mundo futuro non edent, neque bibent, non generabunt liberos, non exercebunt commercia; non est ibi invidia neque odium, neque rixa, sed justi sedebunt coronis cincti et delectabunt se splendore majestatis divinæ."

**30.** *are as the angels.*] St. Luke gives the words more fully: *Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels.* There being no more death, there is no need of the renewal of the race by means of marriage. But this only excludes those physical conditions of marriage which are associated with the natural body. It by no means implies the

31 But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying,

[l Ex. 3. 6.] 32 [l] I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

33 And when the multitude heard *this*, they were astonished at his doctrine.

34 ¶ [m] But when the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together. [m Mark 12. 28.]

35 Then one of them, *which was* a lawyer, asked *him a question*, tempting him, and saying,

---

abolition of all the higher spiritual qualities by which man and woman are distinguished in this life; nor does it imply that the affections cultivated and fostered by the married life on earth may not have their fruit and perfection in the spiritual life.

*of God.*] Omitted in two good MSS, but well supported. F. C. C.

**31.** *that which was spoken unto you by God.*] As recorded by Moses (*even Moses shewed*, Luke xx. 37). No doubt more direct evidence might have been adduced from other parts of the Old Testament, such as Job xix. 26; Isai. xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 2. But our Lord refers to the Pentateuch, not, as has sometimes been supposed, because the Sadducees denied the authority of the other Scriptures, but because Moses was the authority on whose supposed silence the unbelief of the Sadducees was based, and whose positive legislation had been adduced as furnishing an insuperable objection to the doctrine.

**32.** *God is not the God of the dead, &c.*] This comment may be regarded (1), as an authoritative exposition by Him who knew the mind of God—nay, who was Himself the God who appeared to Moses, of the Divine intention in uttering the above words. God did not mean to say "I am He who was the God of Abraham in his lifetime," but "I am now the God of Abraham. The covenant between us (Gen. xvii. 7) exists still; Abraham is still my living servant." But (2) it also implies that this is the natural and proper interpretation of the words, and one which ought to have been discerned by those who knew the Scriptures, and surely it is so. That God should call himself the God of Abraham implies a relation wholly different from that in which He stands towards the beasts that perish. He is their Maker and sustainer; "He giveth to the beast his food;" but He is not *their* God; for they have no conscious relation towards Him as of a person to a person. That man is capable of a personal relation to God as *his* God, implies faculties and aspirations which cannot meet with their adequate object in this life, and therefore point to a life to come. That a feeling of this kind was present to the mind of Abraham himself, and of others of the patriarchs, who confessed themselves strangers and pilgrims on the earth, is stated by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 16): "But now they desire a better country, that is an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." By thus shewing that the books of Moses rightly understood imply, not only a life beyond the grave, but a religious relation of man to God in that life, our Lord strikes at the root of the error which had led the Sadducees to deny the possibility of the resurrection.

### 34-40. The Lawyer's Question.

**35.** *a lawyer.*] The term *lawyer* (νομικός) is used by St. Matthew in this place only. St. Mark does not use it at all, but substitutes in this place the expression *one of the scribes* (εἷς τῶν γραμματέων). From this it would appear that the terms *scribe* and *lawyer* were synonymous, or at least that one is included in the other. An attempt to distinguish them has been founded on Luke xi. 44, 45, but the reading of the best MSS does not authorise the distinction. Other distinctions (such *e.g.* as that the Scribes confined themselves to the study of the text of Scripture, while the lawyers expounded the traditional law; or, on the other hand, that the lawyers explained the text of the law alone, to the exclusion of tradition) are mere conjectures. Looking to the usage of the Evangelists, the two terms may fairly be regarded as synonymous. (For the Scribes, see on ch. vii. 29.)

*tempting him.*] Here, as in Luke x. 25, the expression *tempting* does not necessarily imply an evil intention. It simply means "trying Him"—endeavouring to test His wisdom as a teacher. (Cf. 1 Kings x. 1, where the same word is used by the LXX of the Queen of Sheba coming to *prove* Solomon.) It is quite possible that this man may have honestly wished to test the character of our Lord's teaching before joining the conspiracy of the other Pharisees against Him, or may have been inclined to desist on hearing the wisdom of His former answers (see Mark xii. 28). Hence, though it would appear from verse 34 that the question was put after a discussion among the Pharisees, it by no means follows

36 Master, which *is* the great commandment in the law?

37 Jesus said unto him, [a] Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

[a] Deut. 6. 5. Luke 10. 27.

38 This is the first and great commandment.

39 And the second *is* like unto it, [b] Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

[b] Lev. 19. 18.

40 On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

41 ¶ [c] While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them,

[c] Mark 12. 35. Luke 20. 41.

42 Saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, *The son* of David.

---

that it implies the same purpose as verse 15. There is, therefore, no antagonism between this passage and Mark xii. 34, though the latter account is fuller in detail. "Matthew," as Ebrard observes, "simply mentions the answer which Jesus gave; his sole object being to exhibit the superiority of Jesus. Mark, in accordance with his usual historical style, describes the actual time of the whole occurrence."

**36.** *which is the great commandment.*] Except in the circumstances that the same two commandments are cited, and that the questioner in both instances is a lawyer, there is nothing in common between this narrative and that of Luke x. 25-28. The latter begins with a different question resembling, not the present one, but that of ch. xix. 16, which latter, however, is separately recorded by St. Luke also (xviii. 18). In the present narrative the answer is given by our Lord Himself; in St. Luke's narrative it is elicited from the lawyer. The context and the time are different; and the difference is yet more marked by the addition in St. Luke of the parable of the Good Samaritan. There is no ground for attempting, with Strauss and De Wette, to regard the two narratives as various accounts arising out of the same circumstance, except the two points of similarity mentioned above. But there is nothing remarkable in them. It was among the teachers of the law that the question about greater or smaller commandments was discussed.' (See Schoettgen on this place, and Wetstein on ch. v. 19, xxiii. 23.) And a lawyer therefore was the most likely person on either occasion to ask such a question. On the other point see the next note.

**37.** *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, &c.*] Cited from Deut. vi. 5, nearly according to the LXX. This passage (Deut. vi. 5-9) was one of the four places of Scripture inscribed on the phylacteries, and which all Jews were required to repeat every morning and evening. It is, then, the passage which would most naturally occur to any Jew as the principal point and general summary of the whole law.

*with all thy heart, &c.*] The Vatican text of the LXX (Deut. vi. 5) reads *διάνοια* (*mind*) for the Hebrew לבב (*heart*). The Alexandrine text has *καρδία* (*heart*). In the present verse both words are employed, but *δύναμις*, *power*, the rendering of the Hebrew מאד, is omitted, or perhaps *διάνοια* is exegetically substituted for it. In St. Mark's citation, *καρδία* and *διάνοια* are both retained, and *ἰσχὺς* (*strength*), a more exact rendering, is substituted for the *δύναμις* of the LXX. Taking this as the fullest record of our Lord's words, we may understand this fourfold enumeration, without insisting on exact psychological distinctions, as a command to devote all the faculties to the love of God—the heart, denoting in general terms the affection and will; the *soul*, the perceptive and appetitive powers; the mind, the reflective and reasoning powers; while *with all thy strength* enjoins the full and entire devotion of all these powers, the word מאד being frequently used as an adverb in the sense of *vehemently*, *exceedingly*. (Cf. Göschel, 'Der Mensch, nach Leib, Seele u. Geist,' p. 40, and Delitzsch, 'Bibl. Psych.,' pp. 209, 242, 292, Eng. Tr.)

**39.** *And the second is like unto it.*] This second great commandment (cited according to the LXX version of Lev. xix. 18), though taken from a different part of Scripture, is yet sufficiently associated in matter with the former to make it not improbable that the two may have been sometimes united together, not only, as here, in our Lord's teaching, but also in that of others. The answer of the Scribe, as given in Mark xii. 32, 33, seems to indicate an authoritative approbation of the juxtaposition by some at least of the recognised teachers of the law, and may perhaps account for the same juxtaposition in the words of the lawyer (Luke x. 27; compare Rom. xiii. 8, 9).

### 41-46. The Question of our Lord touching Descent from David.

**41.** *While.*] More exactly, **And while**, the conjunction referring back to the gathering mentioned in verse 34. From Mark xii. 35-37, it appears that the following question, though addressed directly to the Pharisees, was spoken

43 He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying,

44 [b] The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?

[b] Ps. 110. 1.

45 If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?

46 And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any *man* from that day forth ask him any more *questions*.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

1 *Christ admonisheth the people to follow the good doctrine, not the evil examples, of the scribes and Pharisees.* 5 *His disciples must beware of their ambition.* 13 *He denounceth eight woes against their hypocrisy and blindness:* 34 *and prophesieth of the destruction of Jerusalem.*

THEN spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples,

2 Saying, the scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat:

---

in the hearing of the people assembled in the Temple, and equally intended for them.

43. *David.*] The objection of various critics as regards the authorship and interpretation of this Psalm are considered in the commentary on the Psalm itself. In the present place it will be sufficient to observe that our Lord's words cannot fairly be otherwise interpreted than as sanctioning by His own authority the belief that the Psalm was written by David, and written under divine inspiration concerning Christ. To suppose that He sanctioned a popular error for the sake of an apparent victory in argument is equally incompatible with His truthfulness and with the tenor of the passage. If His words are truly recorded, only one of two alternatives is possible: either the Psalm is really David's, or Christ shared the error of the age in ascribing it to David.

*in spirit.*] *I.e.* under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. (Compare *by the Holy Ghost*, Mark xii. 36.) Though the article is omitted in the Greek it should rather be translated "in the spirit," as in Rev. i. 10, iv. 2, xvii. 3, xxi. 10, where the original is the same as here. The fuller expression (also without the article, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ) occurs, Matt. iii. 11; Acts i. 5; Rom. ix. 1, xiv. 7, xv. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Thess. i. 5; 1 Pet. i. 12; Jude 20. The article, indeed, is generally omitted when the influences, as distinguished from the Person, of the Holy Spirit are mentioned. (See Middleton on the Greek Articles, note on Matt. i. 18.)

45. *how is he his son?*] The title "Son of David," as a recognised appellation of the Messiah, had been given to our Lord by the multitude only two days before (ch. xxi. 9), and had been accepted by Him on that and on other occasions. The Pharisees who denied His Messiahship, are by this question convicted of ignorance of the true nature of the Messiah who, while he was the Son of David by human descent, was yet the Lord of David in his Divine Nature. (Compare Acts ii. 34, 35; Rom. i. 3, 4.)

CHAP. XXIII.—THE GREAT DISCOURSE AGAINST THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES.

1. *Then spake Jesus, &c.*] All the Synoptists agree in placing a discourse of our Lord against the Scribes in this place (see Mark xii. 38-40; Luke xx. 45-47), and St. Luke agrees with St. Matthew in stating that the discourse was spoken both to the disciples and to the people. But while St. Matthew gives the discourse at great length, the other Evangelists give only an abridgment, corresponding to verses 5, 6, 7, 14. A similar discourse is also recorded by St. Luke (xi. 39-52) as having been spoken on a different occasion. St. Luke's testimony is conclusive as to the fact that two separate discourses were spoken on this subject, and the only question is whether every parallel between his report of the earlier and St. Matthew's of the later discourse is to be explained on the supposition of a repetition of similar words on the two occasions. Such a supposition is not improbable, and is perhaps the most easily reconciled with the character of the present chapter, which presents all the appearance of a continuous discourse. But, on the other hand, it is not impossible that St. Matthew may, on this, as on other occasions, have arranged his narrative on the principle of similarity of matter rather than of chronological connection. (See note at the end of chapter xviii.)

2. *The scribes and the Pharisees, &c.*] The order of the original should be retained, "Upon the seat of Moses sit the Scribes and the Pharisees." The meaning can hardly be that the Scribes and Pharisees, as such, and consequently all the members of these bodies, were the legitimate successors of Moses as administrators of the law; but rather, that the assembly now exercising that function was chiefly composed of members of those bodies. The allusion seems to be to the Sanhedrim, the supreme national council, for the composition of which see on ch. ii. 11. This body always contained a certain number of professional Scribes, and it is probable that the Pharisees, though not officially members,

3 All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, *that* observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.

4 [c] For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay *them* on men's shoulders; but they *themselves* will not move them with one of their fingers.

5 But all their works they do for to be seen of men: [d] they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments,

6 [e] And love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues,

7 And greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi.

8 [f] But be not ye called Rabbi:

c Luke 11. 46.
d Num. 15. 38. Deut. 22. 12.
e Mark 12. 38. Luke 11. 43.
f James 3. 1.

---

had a preponderating influence in it (see Josephus 'Ant.,' xviii. 1, 4); though some of the members might be Sadducees, as appears from Acts xxiii. 6.

*sit in Moses' seat.*] *I.e.* hold the place formerly held by Moses as the expounder of the laws of God. (See Exodus xviii. 16.) This limits their authority to decisions on matters relating to the law.

3. *All therefore.*] The word *therefore* is emphatic. Ye are to obey them because they sit in Moses' seat, *i.e.* in what belongs to their authorized and official duties as expounders of the law.

*whatsoever they bid you observe.*] *I.e.* what they command in their official capacity as rulers. In its legislative character the Sanhedrim was the supreme authority for deciding controverted questions of the law, as well as for regulating ceremonies of worship, the observance of feasts and other religious duties (cf. Hausrath, 'Neutest. Zeitgeschichte,' p. 67). These seem to be the points chiefly intended here which will not include the glosses and minute distinctions and rules of individual Scribes and Pharisees, such as our Lord Himself on various occasions condemned and disregarded. (See *e.g.* below, verses 16-19, and ch. xii. 1-5, xv. 1-6; Luke xiii. 14, 15; John v. 10.)

4. *heavy burdens.*] This seems to refer to the minute rules laid down by the Scribes for the rigid observance of the law in all conceivable cases, according to the precept ascribed to Simeon the just, "make a fence round the law." Several specimens of this kind of casuistry have been collected by Hausrath, 'Neutest. Zeitgeschichte,' pp. 79-91. To this class belong the minute regulations about washing, cleansing of vessels, &c., which St. Mark represents as founded, not on Scripture, but on the traditions of the elders. (See on Matt. vii. 3.)

*and grievous to be borne.*] These words are omitted in some late editions. They are supposed to be taken from St. Luke, but they are found in very ancient MSS and versions, and should be retained. St. Matthew is careful to record all the words of our Lord. F. C. C.

5. *phylacteries.*] The literal meaning of this word is "preservatives," *i.e.* amulets or charms for protection against evil spirits, or, as some understand, "remembrancers," as promoting the remembrance and observance of the law. The Hebrew Old Testament name is *Totaphoth* (טוטפות, *frontlets*, Ex. xiii. 16; Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18, ἀσάλευτον LXX), and the later term in the Chaldee form, *Tephillin* (תפלין, Heb. תפלות, *prayers*). They consisted of strips of parchment, on which were written four passages of the law, viz., Exod. xiii. 3-10, 11-16; Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21. These were enclosed in a leather case and fastened to the forehead and to the left arm. They were ordered to be worn by all males from the age of fourteen, but the Pharisees appear to have made them conspicuous by wearing them (or perhaps rather the case in which they were enclosed) of an unusual size. The custom of wearing these phylacteries appears to have arisen from a literal interpretation of the passages, Exod. xiii. 9, 16; Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18. (Cf. Josephus, 'Ant.,' iv. 8, 13.) From the absence of all mention of the use of phylacteries in the Old Testament it is probable that the custom of wearing them is not earlier than the Babylonian captivity. A full account of them will be found in Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' Art. *Frontlets.*

*the borders of their garments.*] *I.e.* the fringes (the same Greek word (κράσπεδα) is used in the LXX), which were commanded to be made on the borders of the garments for a memorial (Numb. xv. 38, 39). The wearing of these fringes was in strict obedience to the law. The offence consisted in their unusual size.

7. *Rabbi.*] This word is interpreted (John i. 38) as meaning "Master," or "Teacher" (διδάσκαλος), and the same interpretation is implied here in verse 8, where the true reading is probably not καθηγητής, as in the received text, but διδάσκαλος. The same interpretation is given to the higher title Rabboni, John xx.

for one is your Master, *even* Christ; and all ye are brethren.

9 And call no *man* your father upon the earth: [g] for one is your Father, which is in heaven.

[g] Mal. 1. 6.

10 Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, *even* Christ.

11 But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.

12 [h] And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.

[h] Luke 14. 11. & 18. 14.

13 ¶ But [i] woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in *yourselves*, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.

[i] Luke 11. 52.

---

16 (cf. Mark x. 52). It was a title of honour given to the Scribes as teachers of the law; and appears in three forms, Rab, Rabbi, Rabban. The first of these, usually an adjective signifying *many* or *great*, is also used as a substantive in the sense of *chief* or *leader; e.g.* 2 Kings xxv. 8, where it is rendered *captain*. (Cf. Esther i. 8, *officer*.) As applied to the Scribes, it seems originally to have been given to the teachers of the several schools, who were called *Rabbim* (masters), in distinction from their pupils, the *Talmidim* or scholars. The name was afterwards given to the Scribes in general as distinguished from the people; at first as a mode of address with the pronominal suffix Rabbi (my master), which latter term, like the French *Monsieur*, was itself again used as a substantive, and is interpreted as such, John i. 38. When the title Rabbi became thus extended, the higher teachers were distinguished by the appellation Rabban, the Aramaic form of רבנו "our master," which itself became a substantive capable of the pronominal suffix as in Rabboni, the Galilean form of רבני "my Rabban." The use of these titles as prefixed to personal names (e.g. *Rabbi Joshua*) seems to have been of comparatively late origin. The prophets and elder Scribes, down to the great Hillel, were called simply by their names; and Gamaliel, the grandson, or, according to another account, Simeon the son, of Hillel, is said to have been the first person dignified with the title of Rabban. (See Lightfoot and Rosenmüller on this place.) It is quite in accordance with this tradition that we find the title Rabbi in the Gospels used only as a form of address in speaking *to* a person, not as a title in speaking of him. This is an indirect evidence of the apostolic origin of the Gospels, since from the beginning of the second century the latter usage was prevalent. (See on this, and on the whole question of Rabbinism, the Article *Rabbinismus*, by Pressel, in Herzog's 'Real-Encyklopädie.')

8. *for one is your Master, even Christ.*] *Master*, being the word usually employed by our translators as the rendering of διδάσκαλος, may be retained here, where the true reading is probably διδάσκαλος, though the received text has καθηγητής, which should rather be rendered "Leader." The explanation ὁ Χριστός is omitted in the best MSS, and this omission has given rise to a question whether the Teacher here spoken of is our Lord Himself or the Holy Ghost. The latter interpretation may be supported by John xiv. 26; but when we remember that our Lord on other occasions applies this title to Himself and accepts it from His disciples (Matt. x. 24, xxvi. 18; John xiii. 13, 14), the weight of evidence seems in favour of the former.

9. *And call no man your father, &c.*] This must be interpreted with reference to the context, and is more clear in the original, where the word *father* stands at the beginning of the sentence as emphatic. This word, as well as *master*, was a title of honour given by disciples to their teachers (2 Kings ii. 12; cf. vi. 21), and the command refers to this and not to the natural relation. The Scribes had abused the quasi-parental authority which they enjoyed by substituting their own teaching in the place of God's word; and the precept here may be interpreted as meaning, "Give not that filial reverence to these earthly teachers which is due to your Father in heaven."

10. *masters . . . . Master.*] Rather, **leaders .... Leader.** The Greek word here is καθηγητής, not διδάσκαλος.

12. *And whosoever shall exalt himself, &c.*] These words, which are used by our Lord on various occasions (cf. Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14) are in substance a citation from Ezek. xxi. 26.

13. *ye shut up the kingdom of heaven.*] *I.e.* ye hinder men from acknowledging the true Messiah and becoming members of His Church. (See on ch. iii. 2.) The Scribes as the professed exponents of Scripture should have been the first to recognise Him of whom the Scripture testified. Instead of this, they both rejected Him themselves and used their authority to persuade others to reject Him. In Luke xi. 13 a similar charge is brought on another occasion against the same teachers: "Ye have taken away the key of knowledge," an expression which probably alluded to the symbolical key which was presented to a

14 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! [k]for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.

[k] Mark 12. 40. Luke 20. 47.

15 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.

16 Woe unto you, *ye* blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor!

---

Scribe on admission to his office. (See on ch. vii. 29.)

**14.** *Woe unto you, &c.*] This verse is in some MSS and versions placed before verse 13, but the best authorities omit it altogether, and many recent critics regard it as an interpolation from Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47.

*ye devour widows' houses.*] In theory the instruction given by the Scribes was supposed to be gratuitous, or at least not a source of wealth to the teacher. It is doubtful whether the small fee, first exacted in the time of Herod the Great, was appropriated by the teacher. (Cf. Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' Art. *Scribes.*) The most eminent doctors had exercised a handicraft for their own maintenance, as did St. Paul during his apostolic labours. (Hausrath, 'Neutest. Zeitgesch.,' p. 77.) But indirectly many of the Scribes derived large sums from their profession. Rich and devout widows sometimes maintained a Rabbi to the injury of their own kindred. That the practice was abused by the Scribes may be inferred from this passage. Otherwise to a limited extent, we find similar ministrations accepted by our Lord Himself and His disciples (Luke viii. 3). (This verse is omitted in the oldest MSS and by late editors, F. C. C.)

*the greater damnation.*] literally "more exceeding judgment." This is the earliest passage in which the word *damnation* is used by our translators, the Greek being κρίμα. The word occurs in ten other places, in seven of which (Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47; Rom. iii. 8, xiii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 29; 1 Tim. v. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 3) it is the equivalent of κρίμα as here, while in the remaining three (Matt. xxiii. 33; Mark iii. 29; John v. 29) the Greek word is κρίσις. The stronger terms κατάκριμα and κατάκρισις are never rendered in the Authorised Version *damnation*, but always *condemnation* (Rom. v. 16, 18, viii. 1; 2 Cor. iii. 9, vii. 3). Though the word *damnation* had not at the time of our translation acquired the exclusive meaning which it now bears, its use is to be regretted as in some cases tending to mislead modern readers, and in all conveying a meaning which is rather an inference from the context than a translation of the original word. The words κρίμα and κρίσις never mean damnation, but always judgment, whether favourable or unfavourable, temporal or eternal, must be determined by the context. (See Ellicott on Gal. v. 11; 1 Tim. v. 12.) In the present passage, a comparison with verse 33 may justify us in interpreting the word of eternal condemnation, but it is an interpretation and not a translation.

**15.** *ye compass sea and land.*] The activity with which the work of proselytising was carried in the countries adjacent to Palestine may be inferred from the statement of Josephus ('B. J.,' ii. 20, § 2), that nearly all the women of Damascus were supposed to be addicted to the Jewish religion. See also the account of the conversion of Izates and Helena (Joseph. 'Ant.' xx. 2, §§ 3, 4), and of the number of proselytes made at Antioch ('B. J.,' vii. 3, § 3). Horace ('Sat.' i. 4, 142) testifies to the zeal of the Jews of Rome in making proselytes; Justin Martyr ('Dial. c. Tryph.,' c. 122), after quoting our Lord's words concerning the proselytes, adds that these proselytes blaspheme the name of Christ two-fold more than the Jews themselves; and Juvenal ('Sat.' vi. 542, 547) speaks of the influence that Jewish soothsayers obtained over the Roman women.

*the child of hell.*] Proselytes to Judaism seem to have borne a bad character, both among Gentiles and among Jews. Tacitus ('Hist.,' v. 5) speaks of them as casting off all natural ties. Lightfoot and Schoettgen on this place quote from the Talmud sayings which prove a similar estimate of them (see also Prof. J. B. Lightfoot on Galatians, p. 287). For a further notice of the Proselytes see note at the end of this chapter.

**16.** *Whosoever shall swear, &c.*] Instances of this Rabbinical distinction between valid and invalid oaths are given in Lightfoot's note on ch. v. 33. That the Jews under such instruction acquired an evil reputation among foreign nations as oath breakers, may be inferred from Martial's well-known epigram (xi. 94):—

"Ecce negas, jurasque mihi per templa Tonantis;
Non credo; jura, verpe, per Anchialum."

17 *Ye* fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?

18 And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is [1]guilty.

[1] Or, *a debtor*, or, *bound*.

19 *Ye* fools and blind: for whether *is* greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?

20 Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon.

21 And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein.

22 And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon.

23 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! [l] for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier *matters* of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

[l] Luke 11. 42.

24 *Ye* blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.

25 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! [m] for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess.

[m] Luke 11. 39.

26 *Thou* blind Pharisee, cleanse first that *which is* within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also.

27 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed

---

(Cf. בחי העולם—*by him that liveth for ever*, Dan. xii. 7.) The exact meaning of the expression "the gold of the temple" is uncertain; but the probability is that it refers to money offered as a gift to God, to which the Scribes and Pharisees ascribed peculiar sanctity. (See ch. xv. 5-6.)

**22.** *by heaven.*] Lightfoot on ch. v. 33 quotes from Maimonides a distinction between an oath by created things, heaven, earth, &c., and an oath by Him who created them. The former was not regarded as properly an oath, so as to be binding.

**23.** *ye pay tithe, &c.*] So the Pharisee in the parable boasts, "I give tithes of all that I possess" (Luke xviii. 12). For the law respecting tithes see on Levit. xxvii. 31-33. The tithe was to be taken of the produce of the land and of the flocks and herds (Levit. xxvii. 31, 32), but from Deut. xii. 17, xiv. 23, it has been supposed that the former included only the more important productions, corn, wine, and oil. The Pharisees, however, seem to have extended it to the most trifling articles, even to herbs, not as grown, but as purchased for domestic use. (Cf. Hausrath, 'Neutest. Zeitgesch.,' p. 83.) To this extension the Talmudic sentence quoted by Lightfoot seems to refer, "The tithing of herbs is from the Rabbins."

*judgment, mercy, and faith.*] "In this threefold enumeration, our Lord refers to Micah vi. 8 (see also Hosea xii. 6), where *to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God*, are described as being better than all offerings." (Alford.) The disputed meaning of the last enumerated *faith*, may perhaps be illustrated by the LXX version of Jerem. v. 1, εἰ ἔστι ποιῶν κρίμα καὶ ζητῶν πίστιν, where the Authorised Version has "if there be any that executeth judgment and seeketh the *truth*." Hebr. אמונה, *faithfulness*.

**24.** *strain at a gnat.*] The earlier English translations (Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva) have **strain out a gnat**, which makes the sense clearer and should be adopted.

**25.** *ye make clean the outside, &c.*] For the literal practice of the Pharisees in this respect see Mark vii. 4. Here, however, the language is used figuratively to denote the character of the Pharisees themselves, careful in matters of external observance, careless as regards purity of heart and life. (Cf. Luke xi. 39.) The literal interpretation adopted by several commentators "the food contained in your cup and platter is obtained by extortion and lust of gain" is inconsistent with the language of St. Luke, where the words "your inward part is full" imply a figurative application to the persons themselves.

**27.** *whited sepulchres.*] By the law, any one who touched a grave was unclean for seven days (Numb. xix. 16). In order to avoid this risk, it was customary every year to whiten the sepulchres with a preparation of chalk and water, that they might be easily seen. This was done on the 15th day of the month Adar, so that at the time of the Passover when these words were spoken the marks were still fresh and conspicuous. (See Lightfoot on this place.) In the words recorded by St. Luke (probably spoken on a

appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead *men's* bones, and of all uncleanness.

28 Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

29 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous,

30 And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.

31 Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets.

32 Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers.

33 *Ye* serpents, *ye* generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?

34 ¶ Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and *some* of them ye shall kill and crucify; and *some* of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute *them* from city to city:

---

different occasion) the similitude is reversed, but with the same meaning. The Pharisees are there likened to the unwhitened graves, which men may touch and contract uncleanness therefrom without being aware of it.

29. *the tombs of the prophets.*] These tombs are probably not to be identified with the excavations in the Mount of Olives now bearing this name, of which a description is given by Robinson, 'Later Biblical Researches,' p. 253, and by Ritter, 'Geography of Palestine,' iv. p. 175, Eng. Tr. Both authors agree in rejecting the tradition which connects these sepulchres with the tombs mentioned in the text.

31. *that ye are the children, &c.*] *I. e.* not only by natural descent, but in character also. (Cf. John viii. 39, 40, 44.) By speaking of their fathers they confessed more than they themselves were conscious of. The confession, coupled with their conduct towards Himself, shewed that they had inherited the disposition as well as the blood of those who had slain the prophets, and were ready to repeat their acts. (See on ch. xxi. 35, 37.)

33. *Ye serpents, &c.*] See on ch. iii. 7.

*the damnation of hell.*] See on ch. v. 22, 30.

34. *Wherefore, &c.*] διὰ τοῦτο. For this cause, because ye are like your fathers, and to shew that likeness ye shall have the same warnings through God's servants as your fathers had, and ye will treat His servants as they did. The conduct of these men would be so like that of their fathers that the words of Scripture spoken historically of the latter might be regarded as a prediction of the deeds of their descendants. For this reason St. Luke introduces a similar denunciation with the words, "Therefore also said the wisdom of God," the words of 2 Chron. xxiv. 19 being applicable to this later generation no less than to the former.

*I send unto you prophets, &c.*] The Apostles and their coadjutors are here signified. See ch. xxii. 2, 3, where the same mission is signified in a parable. The Apostles might strictly be called prophets as proclaiming a divine revelation, and as no doubt sharing the prophetic gift, specially so called, in the Christian Church (Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11; cf. Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5); and even in the more limited sense as predicting the future (2 Thess. ii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 3; Rev. i. 1). For predictions by others also see Acts xi. 28, xxi. 4, 10. This verse, together with verses 37, 38, bear a close resemblance to 2 Esdras i. 30-33. The date of the latter book is doubtful, and may probably be as late as the end of the first century A.D. But even if an earlier date be assigned to the original work it will hardly include chs. i. ii., which together with chs. xv. xvi. are not found in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, and are now generally regarded as an interpolation of the Latin translator. This part of the book is evidently the work of a Christian, and the parallel between it and the present passage shows that the former was borrowed from the latter. Wisdom also is enumerated among the gifts of the Spirit to the first preachers of Christianity (1 Cor. xii. 8). The Apostles are also to be "scribes instructed unto the kingdom of heaven" (ch. xiii. 52), and the term, even in its strictest sense, might be given to St. Paul, the pupil of Gamaliel, and to such men as Apollos, "mighty in the Scriptures, and Zenas the lawyer."

*some of them ye shall kill, &c.*] These persecutions are foretold to the Apostles (ch. x. 17, 23, xxiv. 9; John xvi. 2).

35 That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, [n]from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

[n] Gen. 4. 8.

36 Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.

37 [o] O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou* that killest the prophets, [p]and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would [q]I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under *her* wings, and ye would not!

[o] Luke 13. 34.
[p] 2 Chron. 24. 21.
[q] Esdras 1. 30.

38 Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.

39 For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

---

**35.** *Zacharias son of Barachias.*] Zechariah the prophet was the son of Berechiah (Zech. i. 1), but there is no evidence of his having been murdered. Zechariah who was stoned in the temple (2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22) was the son of Jehoiada. The dying words of this Zechariah, "the Lord look upon it and require it," compared with the present verse and with Luke xi. 50, as well as with Gen. iv. 10, make it almost certain that he is the person here spoken of. The Books of Chronicles, in which this murder is recorded, are the last in order in the Hebrew Canon; and the expression "from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias," may naturally be understood as meaning, from the first murder recorded in Scripture to the last. Other murders, such as that of Urijah (Jer. xxvi. 23), and the traditional martyrdoms of Isaiah and Jeremiah are later in point of time, and this circumstance may perhaps account for the mention of the words "son of Barachias," which are omitted not only in St. Luke, but in this place by the 'Codex Sinaiticus.' (*i.e.* ℵ, not in the text, but in the early correction; also by some ancient evangelisteria, and twice by Euseb. cf. Tisch. ed. 8. Jerome says, "in evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni, pro filio Barachiæ filium Joiadæ reperimus scriptum. F. C. C.) They are possibly an early addition to the text, made by a corrector, who supposed the later Zechariah to be intended on account of the chronological difficulty connected with the earlier. The correction betrays a want of familiarity with the order of the Hebrew Canon, which can hardly be attributed to the Evangelist himself. Other hypotheses may be mentioned though decidedly less probable than the above. Ebrard ('Gospel Hist.,' p. 325, Eng. Tr.) supposes from the age of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv. 15) that he must have been the grandfather, not the father of Zechariah, and that the name of the father (Berechiah) was preserved in the genealogies of the priests. A tradition adopted by the statement of Origen, followed by and found in another form in the 'Protevangelium Jacobi,' assigning a similar death to Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, is probably only an adaptation of a Jewish legend concerning the son of Jehoiada, which will be found in Lightfoot's note on this place. The conjecture that our Lord spoke prophetically of Zacharias the son of Baruch, who was afterwards slain in the temple by the zealots, shortly before the siege of Jerusalem (Josephus, 'B. J.,' iv. 5, § 4), is contrary to the whole tenor of the text, the language of which is historical, not prophetical.

*between the temple and the altar.*] According to 2 Chron. xxiv. 21, Zechariah was slain "in the court of the house of the Lord." In the Temple as previously in the Tabernacle, the altar of burnt offerings was in the inner court, or court of the priests, outside of the temple proper (here called ναός) and in front of the porch (called πρόναιον, Joseph. 'Ant.' viii. 3, § 2). See Exod. xl. 29; 2 Chron. viii. 12, xv. 8, and compare Ezek. viii. 16; Joseph. 'Ant.,' viii. 4, § 1; 'B. J.,' v. 5, 6. Hence the expression "between the porch and the altar," Joel ii. 17, equivalent to the present "between the temple and the altar."

**37-39.** *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, &c.*] These words, which occur with a different context Luke xiii. 34, 35, are very appropriate in this place, both as words of pity following the previous denunciation, and as introductory to the desolation of the temple and city, and the coming of the Son of Man foretold in the next chapter. To regard them, with Wieseler ('Chr. Syn.', p. 294, Eng. Tr.), as an interpolation from St. Luke, is to miss entirely their force and appropriateness in the present context. Yet the words as they stand in St. Luke, though less striking, have also an appropriate context, and thus variations in the language of the two records which may be urged in support of the view that they were uttered on both occasions.

**37.** *how often, &c.*] These words seem to imply previous ministrations of our Lord in Jerusalem, and thus may be regarded as a reference to those visits to the city which

are recorded by St. John, but not directly mentioned by the Synoptists.

**38.** *your house is left unto you desolate.*] Regarding this as the true text (which is most probable, notwithstanding the omission in some MSS of the word *desolate*) we are reminded of the denunciation of Ps. lxix. (lxviii.) 25 (26), γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτῶν ἠρημωμένη (LXX). The allusion is not merely to the approaching destruction of the temple, but to the capture and desolation of the city which was destined to be "trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke xxi. 24).

**39.** *till ye shall say, &c.*] These words evidently point to a future acknowledgment by the Jews of their Messiah, to take place after the destruction and desolation of their city. They may be compared with the prediction of Jeremiah xxiii. 8, and Zechariah xii. 10, xiv. 8-11; Rom. xi. 26; 12 Cor. iii. 4. Wieseler, in support of his view that these words are an interpolation from St. Luke, understands them as "declaring His purpose not to visit Jerusalem again before the next Passover," and remarks that subsequently to his last entry into Jerusalem, the people never addressed Him in these words. Surely so lame and commonplace an interpretation of these pathetic words is of itself sufficient to discredit the hypothesis which it is adduced to support.

The narrative of the widow's two mites, which is omitted by St. Matthew, should probably be inserted after the above discourse, according to the arrangement of St. Mark and St. Luke.

---

## NOTE TO CHAPTER XXIII. 15.—PROSELYTES.

The word προσήλυτος is of frequent occurrence in the Septuagint as the usual translation of the Hebrew גֵּר, which in our version is rendered *stranger*. This latter term properly denoted a person of alien race, dwelling within the possessions of the Israelites in the promised land, corresponding nearly to the Greek μέτοικος. These sojourners were of various classes. Some were the descendants of that mixed multitude that accompanied the Children of Israel out of Egypt (Exod. xii. 38). Others were the remnant of the Canaanitish nation, which were never wholly extirpated; to which may be added captives in war, hired servants, traders, and others. In Solomon's time, the number of strangers thus dwelling in the land amounted to as many as 153,600 (2 Chron. ii. 17). It is not to be supposed that all these were proselytes in the later sense of the term; but the circumstances in which they were placed were such as naturally tended to proselytism. The conditions under which the stranger was permitted to dwell in the land were such as were likely to turn his mind away from idolatry and to incline him to the worship of the God of Israel. He was forbidden to blaspheme the name of the Lord (Levit. xxiv. 16), or to take part in the worship of Moloch (Levit. xx. 2), or to imitate the incestuous marriages and other abominations of the heathen nations of the land (Levit. xviiii. 26). In common with the Israelite—he was required to observe the Sabbath (Exod. xx. 10), to eat nothing leavened at the Passover (Exod. xii. 19), to abstain from blood and from the flesh of animals dying naturally or torn by beasts (Levit. xvii. 10, 15), to release his Hebrew servants in the year of Jubilee (Levit. xxv. 54), to observe the Day of Atonement (Levit. xvi. 29), to purify himself in certain cases of ceremonial pollution (Numb. xix. 10), and to offer sin offerings for sins of ignorance (Numb. xv. 29). He was also permitted to partake of the Passover, but only on the condition of being circumcised (Exod. xii. 48), which was also required as a condition of intermarriage (Gen. xxxiv. 14; cf. Josephus).

In this last distinction between the uncircumcised and the circumcised stranger, we have probably the origin of that found in the Rabbinical writings between Proselytes of the Gate and Proselytes of Righteousness. The language of Exod. xii. 48 seems to imply that this submission to the right of circumcision was optional on the part of the stranger, and only necessary in those who wished to be admitted to the Passover. And the same is implied in the exclusion of the stranger, the foreigner, and the hired servant (Exod. xii. 43, 45), *i.e.* of those who, though dwelling in the land temporarily or permanently, were not circumcised. Many would probably be found who, under the above-named conditions, would be led to the worship of the true God without claiming admission to the highest privileges of the Covenant. The Rabbinical writers seem to have regarded the "strangers" of the Old Testament as consisting in a great measure of these partial converts, and to have chosen the title "Proselytes of the Gate" with reference to the Scriptural expression, "the stranger that is within thy gates." The authority of these writers may not be in itself of great value in deciding a historical question; but in this instance they have probability on their side.

In the later Rabbinical precepts, the Proselytes of the Gate are required to observe the so-called seven commandments of Noah, of which however, only two are recorded as having been given to that patriarch, viz., that against murder (Gen. ix. 6), and that against eating of blood (Gen. ix. 4). The other five against idolatry, against blaspheming the name of God, against theft, against unlawful intercourse, and of obedience to authority, are either implied by their own nature or expressly enjoined on the stranger in the Law. The Rabbis claimed for them a higher antiquity, and asserted that six of them were expressly enjoined on Adam, and the seventh, that of abstinence from blood, added to Noah. (Maimonides, cited by Leyrer in Herzog's 'Encyklopädie' Art. *Proselytes*.) There is no reason from Scripture to suppose that these precepts originally formed any part of a solemn rite of initiation—indeed, there is some reason to doubt whether the Rabbinical scheme ever represented a real state of things, or whether it was merely a theoretical sketch of what ought to be, based on a distinction which had actually ceased to exist. (See Mr. Plumptre's Article *Proselytes* in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible.')

The use of the term *proselyte* in the New Testament is probably limited to the higher class of converts, the Proselytes of Righteousness. That there were some at this time who were worshippers of the God of Israel without submitting to the rite of circumcision, is manifest from the history of Cornelius (Acts x.) and is confirmed by that of Izates (Joseph. 'Ant.' xx. 2), but there is no evidence that such persons were called by the name of proselytes, or formally admitted to any kind of religious communion with the Jews; while the temporal privileges which were accorded to the stranger by the Law of Moses ceased, from the nature of the case, when the chosen people no longer possessed the supreme government in their own land. The rise of Pharisaism shortly after the return from the Captivity, and the zeal which under its influence manifested itself in the manner recorded in 1 Macc. ii. 46, and in Josephus 'Ant.' xiii. 9, § 1, xiii. 11, § 3), would naturally lead to the enforcement of circumcision as a condition not only of all religious communion, but to a great extent of social intercourse also (cf. Acts x. 28, xi. 3), and this circumstance may be historical ground of the Rabbinical tradition (explained by themselves in another way) that there had been no Proselytes of the Gate since the time of the Babylonian exile (Maimonides apud Leyrer, *l. c.* p. 249). We may then, though from different premises, accept Lardner's conclusion,[1] that the only proselytes mentioned in the New Testament or recognised as such in that age, were circumcised converts, conforming in all respects to the Law of Moses, though we may hesitate to extend, as he does, the same conclusion to all previous periods of Jewish history.

The only distinctive mark of the full proselytes which can be gathered from the Old Testament is, as has been said above, that they were circumcised, and thus made capable of eating the Passover. The Rabbinical writers represent the admission of proselytes as consisting of three successive steps, circumcision, baptism, and sacrifiee. The baptism of proselytes was regarded by the latter Rabbis as equally necessary with circumcision (Bab-Gemara, cited by Leyrer, p. 246), but it is probable that, in earlier times, it was merely a purification, preliminary to the offering of sacrifice such as is enjoined in other cases (Exod. xxx. 20; Levit. xiv. 9, 10, xv. 13, 14). After the destruction of the temple, when the sacrifice was no longer possible, the baptism seems to have assumed the character of an independent and essential rite, with special reference to the initiation of proselytes; but there is no evidence of its having had this character at earlier periods; and the absence of all mention of it in the Old Testament, or in any works written while the temple was standing, may be regarded at least as a proof that it had not at that time assumed the importance which was afterwards attached to it.

On these grounds it is concluded by Leyrer (*l. c.* p. 247) that the baptism of John was not directly derived from that administered to proselytes, though the same idea, that of repentance and conversion from spiritual uncleanness, was symbolised by both. But this symbolism may be also found in the purification commanded by the Mosaic Law, and it is probably to these and to the figurative language of the Prophets (Isa. i. 16; Ezek. xxxvi. 25) that we should look to find a precedent for the baptism with water unto repentance administered by the forerunner of Christ. (See above on ch. iii. 6.)

---

[1] See his dissertation on the apostolic decree, Acts xv. ('Works,' vol. x. p. 300, Ed. 1838), and compare his History of the Apostles and Evangelists ('Works,' vol. vi. p. 216).

## CHAPTER XXIV.

1 *Christ foretelleth the destruction of the temple:* 3 *what and how great calamities shall be before it:* 29 *the signs of his coming to judgment.* 36 *and because that day and hour is unknown,* 42 *we ought to watch like good servants, expecting every moment our master's coming.*

[r Mark 13. 1. Luke 21. 5.] AND [r] Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to *him* for to shew him the buildings of the temple.

2 And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, [a] There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. [a Luke 19. 44.]

3 ¶ And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what *shall be* the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?

4 And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you.

5 For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.

---

THE LAST GREAT PROPHECY.

1. *And Jesus went out, &c.*] This departure is probably the same as that mentioned in John xii. 36. After this, as St. John says, He hid Himself from them; *i.e.* appeared no more openly before the people, but remained in privacy with His disciples alone.

*his disciples came, &c.*] The incident is more fully related by St. Mark (xiii. 1), who mentions the remark of one of the disciples, a remark naturally suggested by our Lord's prediction of the desolation of the city and temple.

2. *There shall not be left.*] How completely this prophecy was fulfilled may be learned from Josephus, who says that, with the exception of Herod's three great towers and part of the western wall, the whole circuit of the city was so thoroughly levelled and dug up that no one visiting it would believe that it had ever been inhabited ('B. J.' vii. 1, § 1.) See notes on St. Mark.

3. *as he sat upon the mount of Olives.*] We learn from Luke xxi. 37 that our Lord passed the right during the early part of this week on the Mount of Olives, *i.e.* either in the open air on the mountain side, or in the village of Bethany, which was on the eastern slope of the mountain. See notes on St. John.

*the disciples.*] *I.e.*, as St. Mark mentions, Peter and James and John and Andrew. From the form of the question we may infer that two separate events, the destruction of the temple, and the final coming of Christ at the end of the world, were closely connected together in the minds of the disciples. The popular belief of the Jews at this time seems to have been that the coming of the Messiah would be simultaneous with the destruction of the city and the temple, a belief derived from Dan. ix. 26. Some regarded this coming as also the end of the world, while others expected an earthly reign of the Messiah before the end of all things. (Cf. Oehler in Herzog, 'Real-Encyklopädie,' Art. *Messias*, pp. 433, 434.) The disciples, to whom Christ was in one sense already come, and to whom He had foretold His sufferings and death, would naturally associate the destruction of the temple, which had just been predicted to them, with a future coming of Christ, and their question seems to imply an inquiry whether this second coming should also be the end of the world. Our Lord's reply distinguishes, though with the obscurity of prophetic language, between a first coming in judgment during that generation, and a second coming at the end of the world, of which the time was known to none but the Father.

4. *Take heed, &c.*] Our Lord begins with a warning against expecting His immediate return. Many will come claiming to be the Messiah. Do not believe any one of them to be your returned Master.

5. *in my name.*] These words are explained by those which follow, "saying I am Christ," *i.e.* professing to be the Messiah, claiming the title which belongs to me alone. The expression must not be understood as if these persons would claim to be Jesus Himself, or that they would come as His disciples (see on ch. x. 42, xviii. 5), but that they would come as pretenders to His title of Messiah. This description of false Christs who would come during the lifetime of some of the Apostles, may therefore apply to such persons as the Theudas mentioned by Josephus, 'Ant.' xx. 5, § 1; the other impostors mentioned 'Ant.' xx. 8, §§ 6, 10; 'B. J.' ii.

6 And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all *these things* must come to pass, but the end is not yet.

7 For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places.

---

13, § 5 (cf. Acts xxi. 38); Simon Magus, who seems to have proclaimed himself as the Messiah (see St. Jerome on this place, Burton, Bampt. Lect. x. p. 107; Möller in Herzog, xiv. p. 391); his rival Dositheus and his disciple Menander, who advanced similar pretences. See Origen c. Cels. i. p. 372, vi. p. 638, Ed. Delarue; Irenæus i. 23; Euseb. 'H. E.' iii. 26. Cf. Köstlin, 'Der Ursprung der Synopt. Evang.' p. 20.

Mr. Greswell ('Parables,' ii. p. 531, *seq.* v. p. 380) has called attention to the remarkable fact that, while many of these false Messiahs appeared in the interval between our Lord's Ascension and the Jewish war, there is no evidence that any one arose claiming this title before the beginning of His ministry. It was necessary, he infers, that the true Christ should first appear, and be rejected by the great body of the nation, before they were judicially given over to the delusions of false Christs.

6. *wars and rumours of wars.*] *I.e.* wars actual and threatened (not, as Bengel and Meyer interpret, near and distant). Several of these, affecting the Jews, belong to the period between this time and the destruction of Jerusalem. Such are the intended war of the Romans against Aretas, hindered by the death of Tiberius (Joseph. 'Ant.' xvii. 5, § 3), and of Caligula against the Jews (Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. 8, § 2; cf. xix. 1, 2), the insurrections against Cumanus in the reign of Claudius ('Ant.' xx. 5, § 3; and 6, §§ 1, 2), and against Felix and Festus in that of Nero ('Ant.' xx. 8, §§ 6-10), and lastly the great Jewish war, which was commenced in the 12th year of Nero (A.D. 66), and lasted four years before the final destruction of the city. In fact, from the procuratorship of Cumanus, (A.D. 48 to A.D. 66) the country may be considered as having been in a constant state of tumult (ἀκαταστασία, Luke xxi. 9), culminating in war. The predictions in this and the following verses have exercised the ingenuity of the Tübingen critics in two opposite directions. Baur ('Krit. Unters.' p. 605 *seq.*), assuming, of course, that the prophecy must have been forged after the event, fixes the date of this gospel in the latter part of Hadrian's reign, on the plea that the above predictions were not fulfilled till the insurrection of Bar Chochba. Köstlin, on the contrary ('Der Ursprung der Evang.' pp. 17 *seq.*, 119 *seq.*), from the same assumption, adduces the exact fulfilment of the prediction as a proof that the gospel was written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. The two critics may be left to answer each other.

*but the end is not yet.*] The end (τὸ τέλος) should not be definitely interpreted either as the end of Jerusalem and the Jewish polity, or as the end of the world. The word is purposely left indefinite, to suit the remaining part of the prophecy, which is so expressed as to be partially applicable to the former event, but with a further typical reference to the latter.

7. *nation shall rise against nation.*] Assuming the conflicts here foretold to be such as would especially affect the Jews, and thus be a sign to the disciples dwelling in Judea, and comparing the parallel language of Isaiah xix. 2, Mr. Greswell ('On the Parables,' v. p. 229) understands this prophecy as relating to the disturbances between Gentiles and Jews dwelling in the same region, which began to take place shortly after this time, and continued to the beginning of the great Jewish war. For some time previously, Gentiles and Jews had been living for the most part amicably together, but this period was distinguished by a series of such outbreaks, mostly commencing with insults offered by the Gentiles to the Jewish religion or customs. Such were those at Alexandria, A.D. 38 (Philo c. Flaccum, § 6, p. 522, Mangey); at Seleucia about the same time (Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. 9, § 9); at Samaria, A.D. 39 or 40 (Philo, 'De Leg. ad Caium,' § 30, p. 575); the disturbance at the Passover, A.D. 49, in which 20,000 Jews perished (Josephus, 'Ant.' xx. 5, § 3); the tumult at Cæsarea, probably A.D. 59 (Joseph. 'Ant.' xx. 8, § 7); and again, A.D. 66 (Joseph. 'Ant.' xx. 8, 9; 'B. J.' ii. 14, § 5). This last event was immediately followed by the war.

*kingdom against kingdom.*] If we may distinguish the conflict of nations, *i.e.* of different races under one government, from that of *kingdoms*, *i.e.* of countries under different governments, we may perhaps enumerate as instances of the latter, the war between Herod and Aretas, probably A.D. 34 (Joseph. 'Ant.' xviii. 5, §§ 1-3), that between Izates the proselyte king of Adiabene and the Arabians and Parthians (*Ibid.* xx. 4, §§ 1, 2), and possibly that between the Romans and the Parthians (Tac.

b ch. 10. 17. Luke 21. 12. John 16. 2.

8 All these *are* the beginning of sorrows.

9 [b]Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake.

---

'Ann.' xiii. 6, 34, xiv. 23). Mr. Greswell's explanation referring to contests of the Jews with the Samaritans, the occupants of the ancient kingdom of Israel, seems forced.

*famines, and pestilences.*] The word *pestilences* is omitted in some MSS and recent editions, and may have been interpolated from Luke xxi. 11. Famines are usually accompanied by pestilences, and both are distinctly mentioned as having happened within this period. Famines are recorded in the reign of Claudius, in Rome twice (Dio Cass. lx. 11; Suet. 'Claud.' 18; Tac. 'Ann.' xii. 43); in Palestine (Acts xi. 28, Joseph. 'Ant. xx. 2, 5); and in Greece (Eusebii 'Chron.' Anno Claudii, 9); and another in the reign of Nero (Suet. 'Nero,' c. 45). Pestilences are mentioned in Babylonia (Jos. 'Ant.' xviii. 98); and in Italy (Suet. 'Nero,' 39; Tac. 'Ann.' xvi. 13). The famine at the siege of Jerusalem is described by Josephus in a manner which implies the accompaniment of pestilence. (See 'B. J.' v. 12, §§ 3, 4, vi. 1, § 1, vi. 9, § 3. Cf. 'B. J.' iv. 6, § 1.) And, though our Lord's words seem to refer to a period earlier than this final tribulation, the known fact that scarcity is almost always accompanied by sickness will probably warrant us in regarding the earlier historical records of the former as implying the latter also.

*earthquakes, in divers places.*] The words κατὰ τόπους, literally "each in its place," "here and there," may fairly (notwithstanding De Wette's and Meyer's objection) be translated *in divers places*, and may apply to the famines and pestilences, as well as to the earthquakes. Besides the earthquake at Jerusalem recorded by Josephus ('B. J.' iv. 4, 5), the following are mentioned in Dean Alford's note on this place: "A great earthquake in Crete, A.D. 46 or 47 (Philostratus, 'Vit. Apollon.' iv. 34). One at Rome on the day when Nero assumed the toga virilis, A.D. 51 (Tac. 'Ann.' xii. 43, Zonaras apud Greswell, 'Parables,' vol. v. p. 258). One at Apamæa in Phrygia, A.D. 53 (Tacitus, 'Ann.' xii. 58). One at Laodicea in Phrygia, A.D. 60 (Tac. 'Ann.' xiv. 27). One in Campania, A.D. 62 or 63 (Tac. 'Ann.' xv. 22; Seneca, 'Nat. Quæst.' vi. 1), and others in the previous year in Macedonia and Achaia (Seneca, 'Nat. Quæst.' vi. 11). Seneca, 'Ep.' 91, § 9, in the year A.D. 58, writes:—'Quoties Asiæ, quoties Achaiæ urbes uno tremore ceciderunt! quot oppida in Syria, quot in Macedonia devorata sunt? Cyprum quoties vastavit hæc clades? quoties in se Paphus corruit? frequenter nobis nuntiati sunt totarum urbium interitus.'" The liability of Judea and its vicinity to earthquakes (see Greswell, *l. c.* p. 255) makes it probable that some may have occurred within the predicted period which are not recorded in history.

8. *the beginning of sorrows.*] Literally "of travail-pains" (ὠδίνων). This image is sometimes used in the Old Testament simply to express great pain, as in Psa. xlviii. 6; Jer. vi. 24, xiii. 21, xxii. 23 (cf. 1 Thess. v. 3); but in the present place the word seems to be expressly chosen to denote the birth-pangs of a new world, the death of the Jewish state and Church being, as it were, the birth of the Christian Church. So St. Paul, extending the same image, says (Rom. viii. 22), "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together (συνωδίνει) until now."

9. *Then.*] *I.e.* during this time, not after it. The "beginnings of sorrows" are represented as lasting for a time, during which the Christian Church is being gradually formed in the midst of persecutions. St. Luke (xxi. 12) marks the time more definitely by the words *before all these*, shewing that the persecutions are to commence at the beginning of this period, before the appearance of the signs just spoken of. And this was actually the case, as the persecutions commenced immediately after the Day of Pentecost. For the fulfilment in detail of this prophecy, see Acts iv. 3, v. 18, 40, vii. 59, viii. 3, xii. 1, 2, xiv. 19, xvi. 19-24, xxii. 30, xxiv. 1, xxv. 2, 3.

*shall they deliver you, &c.*] See on ch. x. 17. St. Mark and St. Luke give the details of the persecutions more minutely here, as St. Matthew has done on the former occasion on which similar words were spoken.

*ye shall be hated of all nations.*] Though addressed directly to the Apostles, these words will naturally include the hatred of the doctrine which they preached, and, through it, of those who embraced it. The words are, therefore, fulfilled by the hatred felt towards Christians in general (see Acts xxviii. 22, and compare the words of Tacitus, 'Ann.' xv. 44: "Christianos, per flagitia invisos" and "exitiabilis superstitio,' with 1 Pet. ii. 12), as well as by the reviling and defamation of the Apostles themselves (1 Cor. iv. 12, 13). Other heathen authors use language similar to that of Tacitus, see Sueton. ('Nero,' 16), "Superstitionis novæ et maleficæ," and Pliny ('Ep.' x. 97), "flagitia cohærentia nomini."

10 And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another.

11 And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many.

12 And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.

13 But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.

14 And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for

---

10. *And then shall many be offended.*] The prediction now passes entirely from the Apostles to the Church in general. Many of its professed members shall be offended (shall stumble because of the persecution, cf. ch. xiii. 21), and shall fall away from the faith.

*shall betray one another, &c.*] So Tacitus says of the Christians in Nero's persecution: "Primo conrepti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio illorum multitudo ingens."—'Ann.' xv. 44. (Alford.)

11. *false prophets.*] Not, as in verse 5, false Messiahs, but false teachers among professing Christians; such, for instance, as the judaising opponents of St. Paul (Acts xv. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 13; Gal. i. 7, vi. 12; Col. ii. 16; Titus i. 10), as Hymenæus, Alexander, and Philetus (1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 17). The antichrists and false prophets denounced by St. John (1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 1, 3; 2 John 7) probably belong to a later period, after the destruction of Jerusalem, which may perhaps also be the case with the false teachers predicted by St. Peter (2 Pet. ii. 1) and described by St. Jude.

*shall deceive many.*] The extent of this deception is testified by St. Paul, Rom. xvi. 18; 2 Tim. iii. 6; Titus i. 10, 11.

12. *iniquity.*] Literally "lawlessness" (ἀνομία). We are naturally reminded of the *mystery of iniquity* (τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας), 2 Thess. ii. 7, which was already working when St. Paul wrote, but which was yet to be more fully revealed. That a spirit of lawlessness had penetrated into the Christian Church at this time is evident, both from the presence of false teachers who rejected the authority of our Lord and His Apostles, and from the Epistle of St. James, written from Jerusalem to Jewish Christians, which testifies not only to the prevalence of particular sins (ch. ii. 1, 6, 9, iii. 10, 14, 16, iv. 2, 3, 4, 8, 16, v. 4-6), but also to the existence of a spirit of contumaciousness, trusting in a dead faith and neglecting good works. Yet this state of things, though partially fulfilling our Lord's prediction, cannot be regarded as exhausting it; and the language of St. Paul, having reference no doubt to this very passage, points to a future and fuller development of lawlessness hereafter, in which the signs which preceded the fall of Judaism shall be repeated as precursors of the last judgment.

*the love of many.*] Rather, **of the many** (τῶν πολλῶν). The generality of Christians, though not guilty of open apostasy, will have left their first love, tainted by the spirit of lawlessness which would prevail around them both within their own body and without. The testimony of Josephus shows the utter lawlessness of Jewish society in the last days of Jerusalem, from the influence of which the Christian Church had not escaped. (See the last note.)

13. *he that shall endure unto the end, &c.*] The *end* can hardly here mean the end of the Jewish state, still less the end of the world; nor can the salvation spoken of be understood of delivery from the perils of the siege. It may be true, as has been stated, that no Christian is known to have perished at the destruction of Jerusalem, but the context here points, not to nominal Christians, but to those who retain their faith and love, when those of others have been lost or waxed cold. He that shall endure the trials and persecutions allotted to him until they shall come to an end, either in themselves or by his own death, shall receive eternal life in the world to come. (Cf. Mark x. 30.)

14. *this gospel of the kingdom.*] By *this gospel* is meant the Gospel committed to the Apostles, and on account of which they would suffer persecution. This gospel shall be preached notwithstanding the rise of false teachers (who will preach another gospel, Gal. i. 6) and the coldness of the many. For the expression *gospel of the kingdom*, see on ch. iv. 23.

*shall be preached in all the world.*] To a partial extent this prediction may be said to have been fulfilled before the destruction of Jerusalem, the distinction between Jew and Gentile having been removed, and the seed sown as it were in a field recognised as coextensive with the whole world, though not in every portion of that field. *The world* (ἡ οἰκουμένη) must here be understood of the whole earth, as including *all nations*. In this sense our Lord commands His Apostles to teach all nations (ch. xxviii. 19), and St. Paul speaks of the Gospel as having gone out

a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.

15 [c] When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken

c Mark 13. 14.

into all the earth (Rom. x. 18), as being present (παρόντος) in all the world (ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ), and as having been preached in the hearing of every creature which is under heaven (ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν), Col. i. 6, 23. Yet the partial nature of this fulfilment points to a later and fuller accomplishment hereafter, when the Gospel shall be actually preached to the whole world, before the end of all things.

15. *When ye therefore, &c.*] The word *therefore* may perhaps be best understood as directly taking up the first question asked in verse 4, which had hitherto been only indirectly touched upon. Our Lord had previously told His disciples what were not to be regarded as immediate prognostics of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, using, however, in the latter part of His description (verses 10-14), words which have a further application to the antitype, the end of the world. He now proceeds to mention the direct sign of the former event, and resumes the second person as speaking of things which were to happen during the existing generation, and in the lifetime of some at least among His hearers.

*the abomination of desolation.*] St. Luke substitutes "When ye shall see *Jerusalem compassed with armies*," which may probably be regarded as a paraphrase, intended to explain to Gentile readers the meaning (or rather the mode of fulfilment) of the obscure prophecy of Daniel. The original expression here (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως) occurs (with only a slight variation between the plural and the singular) in three passages of the LXX translation of Daniel (ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11). In the second of these, and perhaps in the third, it refers to the pollution of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, and is interpreted in 1 Macc. i. 54, 59 of the idolatrous altar set up there. The first passage in Daniel clearly refers to something which is to follow the coming and death of the Messiah, *i. e.* to something connected with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. From Josephus ('Ant.' x. 11, § 7) it seems to have been the belief of the Jews that Daniel foretold the Roman desolation, as well as that by Antiochus. The original in Dan. ix. 27 may be more literally translated, "And upon the pinnacle of abominations a desolation." (See Hengstenberg, 'Christol.' iii. 168, Eng. Tr., and Pusey on Daniel, p. 185.) Thus rendered, it seems to refer to an abomination to be punished by desolation. So the idol set up in the Temple by Manasseh led to the destruction of the first Temple (2 Kings xxi. 7-15), and the name may thus have been applied to the idol of Antiochus, though (in the case of the latter, the act of a foreign tyrant, though assisted by Jewish apostates) the desolation did not proceed to utter destruction. (Cf. Hengstenberg, 'Christol.' iii. 172-177, Eng. Tr.) Following this clue, we should naturally understand the present passage as implying some pollution of the Temple by the Jews, to be punished by its destruction at the hands of the Romans. The pollution has been with great probability identified with the atrocities committed in the Temple by the Zealots, particularly their seizure of the Holy Place and profane performance of sacrifices (Josephus, 'B. J.' iv. 3, §§ 6-8), and the murders committed in the Temple (*ibid.* iv. 5, § 2). Josephus himself ('B. J.' iv. 6, § 3; cf. vi. 2, § 1) speaks of the conduct of these zealots as the fulfilment of an ancient saying, that the Temple would be destroyed when it had been polluted by the Jews themselves; and it is at least probable that the prediction here spoken of is the very prophecy of Daniel. (Cf. Hengstenberg on the genuineness of Daniel, p. 215, Eng. Tr. See Alford and Wordsworth on this place, and Hengstenberg, Christol. p. 183.)

If the above interpretation be adopted, the parallel expression of St. Luke is not difficult to explain. He confines his interpretation to the latter part of the sign, the *desolation*, and speaks of the avenging armies of Rome as showing that the desolation of Jerusalem is nigh.

The above interpretation seems on the whole to be the most probable, and the most consistent with the natural meaning of *the holy place.* But Mr. Greswell ('Parables,' v. 318, *seq.*) argues with much learning and ability in support of the more usual interpretation, which identifies the abomination with the eagles of the Roman armies encircling the city. He considers the prophecy as fulfilled at the first siege of Jerusalem by Cestius Gallus, A.D. 66. His remarks are well worth studying, though his interpretation seems hardly so probable as that given above.

*in the holy place.*] This expression is sometimes used for the Temple in general (see Acts xxi. 28), but here it may probably be understood of the Holy Place, properly so called (σκηνὴ . . . . ἥτις λέγεται ἅγια, Hebr. ix. 2) the outer sanctuary. (Cf. Exod. xxvi. 33.) For this, according to Josephus ('B. J.' iv. 3, 6), was profanely occupied by the zealots. His words are remarkable: μέχρι τῶν εἰς ἀνθρώπους ὑπερεμπλησθέντες ἀδικημάτων ἐπὶ τὸ

[d] Dan. 9. 27.

of by [d] Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:)

16 Then let them which be in Judæa flee into the mountains:

17 Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house:

18 Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes.

19 And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days!

20 But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day:

21 For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.

---

*θεῖον μετήνεγκαν τὴν ὕβριν, καὶ μεμιασμένοις τοῖς ποσὶ παρήεσαν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον.* St. Mark uses the less definite expression, *standing where it ought not*, which probably represents the words actually used, and which are interpreted by St. Matthew.

*whoso readeth, let him understand.*] In the absence of all MS authority for the omission of these words, I am unable to regard them, with Alford, as "an ecclesiastical note which has found its way into the text." Bengel regards them as a parenthesis inserted by St. Matthew himself (as well as by St. Mark) to warn their first readers to prepare for the time of flight—a view which is followed by Kuinoel, Olshausen, Meyer, and others. This interpretation, if adopted, will furnish a ground for fixing the date of both gospels before the destruction of Jerusalem; but it seems more probable that the words are part of our Lord's own discourse, and are intended to call the attention of His hearers to the book of Daniel. Compare the words of the angel to Daniel himself (ix. 25), "Know therefore, and understand." This explanation is not invalidated even if we allow that the express reference to Daniel is not part of the genuine text of St. Mark, since the mention of "the abomination of desolation" necessarily implies an allusion to Daniel, even if that prophet is not cited by name.

**16.** *let them which be in Judæa flee.*] The exhortation to flight is given to those in the adjacent country as well as to those in the city (verse 17). As regards the latter, it would be necessary that they should avail themselves of the warning before the final investment of the city made escape impossible. This condition is quite compatible with the explanation of the abomination of desolation given above. For the pollution recorded by Josephus ('B. J.' iv. 3, 6-8) occurred between the first investment of the city by Cestius, A.D. 66 ('B. J.' ii. 19, § 4), and its final investment by Titus, A.D. 70 ('B. J.' v. 12, § 2; Tac. 'Hist.' v. 11). Lewin ('Fasti Sacri,' p. 348) places it in A.D. 67. During the interval which followed the retreat of Cestius the way of escape from the city was open.

*into the mountains.*] This expression might fairly include the flight of the Christians to Pella (Euseb. 'H. E.' iii. 5; Epiphanius, 'Hær.' xxix. c. 7). The site of this city has been identified by Robinson ('Later Researches,' p. 320; cf. Stanley, 'Sinai and Palestine,' p. 330) with the ruins of Fahil, among the hills of Gilead, and the road to it from Jerusalem lay across the chain of hills which form the western boundary of the plain of Jordan. Epiphanius, *l. c.*, speaks of the flight to Pella as having been commanded by Christ himself, and apparently places it shortly before the siege of Jerusalem. (Cf. De Mens. et Pond. c. 15.) But Eusebius assigns the cause of the flight to a revelation (*κατά τινα χρησμὸν δι' ἀποκαλύψεως*) given to some distinguished members of the Church at Jerusalem, and apparently places it before the war.

**17.** *not come down.*] This has been variously interpreted, of passing over the flat roofs from house to house, and so to the city walls, or of descending by the outside without entering the house. But these minute explanations seem uncalled for. The meaning of the precept is simply that they should flee for their lives, taking no thought of their goods in the house.

**20.** *neither on the sabbath day.*] It is possible that many Jewish Christians might feel a scruple at journeying to any distance on the Sabbath (see on ch. xx. 34), though our Lord's words cannot be understood as sanctioning such a feeling. But the words may be understood as principally referring to the external impediments which would hinder a flight on the Sabbath from the difficulty of procuring means or assistance from others. Cf. Dr. Hessey's 'Bampton Lectures,' Lect. v. p. 174: "In a nation like that of the Jews, in which the fiction of the 'Sabbath-day's journey' prevailed extensively, it was no doubt considered wrong to assist the traveller, however urgent his errand, in his movements on the Sabbath-day. All possible impediments, therefore, would be thrown in the way of the fugitives by those who were still zealous for the supposed requirements of the law."

**21.** *For then shall be great tribulation, &c.*]

22 And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened.

23 ^t Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here *is* Christ, or there; believe *it* not.

^t Mark 13. 21. Luke 17. 23.

24 For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; inso-

---

The words of Daniel xii. 1 relating, in the first instance, to the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, are here applied to the destruction of Jerusalem, the one event being typical of the other. Alford quotes the similar language of Josephus after the event ('B. J.' Procem. § 4): *τὰ γοῦν πάντων ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀτυχήματα πρὸς τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἡττᾶσθαί μοι δοκεῖ κατὰ σύγκρισιν.*

**22.** *unless those days should be shortened.*] St. Mark's language, "except the Lord had shortened those days," expresses what St. Matthew's implies, that the circumstances which contributed to shorten the siege of Jerusalem were ordered by the providence of God for that purpose. The whole siege by Titus occupied less than five months, and the conduct of the besieged themselves considerably shortened the resistance they might otherwise have made. Josephus ('B. J.' v. 1, 4) mentions the destruction by the seditious party of the supplies of corn and provisions which would have been sufficient for a siege of many years, and the consequent speedy reduction of the city to famine. The seditions which prevailed within the city contributed to hasten its overthrow; and the final abandonment of the strongest part of the fortifications enabled the Romans, as Josephus says, to obtain by fortune what they could not have taken by force ('B. J.' vi. 8, § 4). Titus himself indeed confessed that his success in this respect was owing to Divine assistance ('B. J.' vi. 9, § 1).

*there should no flesh be saved.*] The enormous loss of life during even the short siege which was permitted is evidenced by the statement of Josephus ('B. J.' vi. 9, § 3), who estimates the number of those who perished in the siege at 1,000,000, in addition to 97,000 taken captive during the war.

*for the elect's sake.*] *The elect* in this verse can hardly be understood in a different sense from that in verses 24, 31, though it may be limited by the context to a portion only of those so called. It must be understood of Jews believing in Christ (*λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος—ἡ ἐκλογή*, Rom. xi. 5, 7), either actual believers, some of whom might have been unable to leave the city, or some whom their very sufferings might lead to belief. Taken by themselves, the words might perhaps be understood as referring to God's covenant with His chosen patriarchs (Cf. Ps. cv. 6; Rom. xi. 28; Levit. xxvi. 42-45), but verse 24 seems to favour the reference to the living generation.

**23.** *Then if any man shall say unto you, &c.*] As the coming of Christ was not to be expected at the "beginning of sorrows" (see verse 5), neither is it now to be expected in the time of greatest tribulation. The disciples are warned that neither the one time nor the other is to be confounded with that of the coming of their Lord. False Christs will come during both, but the true Christ is not yet to be expected.

**24.** *false Christs, and false prophets.*] See on verse 6. That impostors of this kind continued to appear down to and beyond the end of the Jewish war, both in Jerusalem and elsewhere, is testified by Josephus ('B. J.' vi. 5, § 2, vii. 11, § 1). It is not indeed distinctly stated of these men, or of the previous impostors mentioned in this work, that they professed to be the Messiah, yet in the circumstances of the times, and the expectation of the people, such a profession would be one of the most probable means of deception. But the words are not to be limited to this period. Our Lord is speaking with reference to His second as well as to His first coming, and warns, not only His living disciples, but those also who should come after them, that many false Christs would appear in the world before the one and the other coming of the true Christ; perhaps at various times before the latter. There is no chronological difficulty in including not only such instances as Barcochebas (Euseb. 'H. E.' iv. 6), but others which may be yet future, such as are implied in the deceptions of Antichrist foretold by St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 3-10.

*shall shew, &c.*] Literally, "shall give." The *giving* of signs and wonders does not necessarily imply their real performance, nor even the appearance of it. The word is sometimes used for the actual manifestation, as in ch. xii. 39, and in Joel ii. 30 (LXX); cf. Acts ii. 19. But in Deut. xiii. 1 the *giving* of a sign or wonder, *i.e.* the promise (*ἐὰν ἀναστῇ . . . . καὶ δῷ σοι σημεῖον ἢ τέρας*, LXX) is distinguished from the performance of the promise. (Cf. 1 Kings xiii. 3.) Josephus mentions promises of this kind made by false prophets ('Ant.' xx. 5, § 1 and 8, § 6; 'B. J.' ii. 13, § 4, vi. 5, § 2, vii. 11, § 1), but it is probable that the words have a further and more com-

much that, if *it were* possible, they shall deceive the very elect.

25 Behold, I have told you before.

26 Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, *he is* in the secret chambers; believe *it* not.

27 For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.

28 *f* For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

29 ¶ Immediately after the tribulation of those days *g* shall the sun be

*f* Luke 17. 37.
*g* Isai. 13. 10. Ezek. 32. 7. Joel 2. 31. Mark 13. 24. Luke 21. 25

---

plete reference to future "signs and lying wonders" (2 Thess. ii. 9).

**26.** *Wherefore if they shall say.*] This and the two next verses are omitted by St. Mark, and are given by St. Luke in a different context (xvii. 23, 24, 37). The passage in St. Luke has no note of time, and may possibly have been inserted in that place to contrast our Lord's teaching to His own disciples with that on the same subject to the Pharisees (verses 20, 21), without implying that the two were spoken at the same time. But whether we take this view or regard the words as spoken on two separate occasions, the continuity of the discourse in the present chapter is hardly reconcileable with any other supposition than that it was spoken as a single whole.

**27.** *For as the lightning, &c.*] The coming of Christ shall not be an obscure one, confined to a particular place, and signified from thence by report, but one visible to the whole world. Surely this again is an intimation that the second coming of Christ is not to be identified with any local event, such as the destruction of Jerusalem, however important that event may be in the place where it occurs.

**28.** *For wheresoever the carcase is, &c.*] The interpretation which has been given of verse 27 makes it impossible in the present verse to understand, as many do, the *carcase* as denoting the city of Jerusalem, and the *eagles* as referring to the Roman ensigns. The saying is found in Job xxxix. 30, and alludes to the well-known instinct of the vulture, some species of which appear to have been anciently classed among eagles. (See Arist. 'Hist. An.' ix. 32; Pliny, 'N. H.' x. 3; and Sundevall, 'Die Thierarten der Aristoteles,' pp. 104-106.) Here it must be understood in a purely figurative sense, having probably become a proverb. As the eagles are found wherever there is a carcase to prey upon, so the judgment of Christ will come wherever there are sinners to be judged, *i. e.* over the whole world. (Cf. Hos. viii. 1.) The proverbial character of the language (Cf. Seneca, 'Ep.' 95, "Vultur est, cadaver exspectat") is opposed to a minute explanation of its details, and therefore it is hardly necessary to pursue the simile further by finding in the *eagles* the angels whom Christ will send forth (verse 31, and ch. xiii. 41).

A very different interpretation is supported by many earlier and later expositors (see the authorities in Bp. Wordsworth and Meyer on this place), according to which the dead body (τὸ πτῶμα) is that of Christ, and the eagles His saints, who flock to His presence and feed on Him, especially in the Holy Communion. Notwithstanding the high authorities by which this interpretation is supported, I cannot help regarding it as open to grave objection in itself, and as utterly irreconcileable with the context, which speaks of Christ's presence, not in grace, but in judgment.

**29.** *Immediately after the tribulation, &c.*] Having spoken of the manner of His coming, as visible like the lightning, our Lord next speaks of the time of it, at the end of the tribulation. In interpreting this very difficult passage, it is necessary to remember, (1) That our Lord had previously spoken of coming in His kingdom during the lifetime of some who heard Him,—that coming being mentioned in connection with His glory and His judgment of all men,—and described in language which seems to date the commencement of His kingdom at the destruction of Jerusalem. (See on ch. xvi. 27, 28.) (2) That in ch. xxii. 7-10 the parable represents the Gentiles as being called into Christ's kingdom after the destruction of Jerusalem, which shews that the kingdom which is immediately to follow that event is on earth and not in heaven. (3) That St. Peter, on the Day of Pentecost, cites the words of Joel ii. 30, 31, which have a close resemblance to verse 29 of this chapter, as part of the prophecy fulfilled on that day. (4) That it is impossible that the Apostle, to whom the Lord's words had so recently been spoken, could have regarded those words as literally fulfilled at this time, before the tribulation had begun. From these considerations we may infer (1) That the *last days* (Acts ii. 17, substituted for the μετὰ ταῦτα of the LXX) were regarded by the Apostles as an indefinite period—the time of the Messiah's kingdom on earth; cf. Hebr. i. 2: *last*, as following the older dispensation, and having none subsequent to it, but not as necessarily implying the immediate end of the world. (2) That the phenomena of

darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken:

30 And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, [k] and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

[k] Rev. 1. 7.

those days are grouped together in a single prophetic announcement, as all belonging to the same dispensation, but without implying immediate temporal succession to each other. (Cf. 2 Pet. iv. 8.) (3) That the mention of these phenomena as fulfilled at a certain time does not necessarily imply more than the introduction of the dispensation of which such phenomena form a part.

*shall the sun be darkened, &c.*] It must be remembered that these words are a repetition of language used by the prophets to express figuratively the downfall of kingdoms. Isaiah xiii. 10 speaks in this way of the destruction of Babylon, and Ezekiel xxxii. 7 of that of Egypt; and in Isaiah xxxiv. 4 there is a primary reference to Edom, as here to Jerusalem. It can hardly be doubted that our Lord, in adopting this prophetic language, intended it in the first instance to suggest a similar meaning, without, however, excluding a future and more literal fulfilment, of which the convulsions of human society may be in some measure typical. The analogy of the prophetic language seems to warrant us in interpreting the present passage as referring primarily and immediately to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the consequent extinction of the Jewish nation as a nation, which was to follow immediately after the tribulation, or sufferings of the siege, forming in fact the concluding scene of it. This event may be regarded in one sense as the commencement of the coming of Christ in His kingdom; see on ch. xvi. 28. But probably this does not exhaust even the temporal meaning of the prediction. The similarity of the next verse to Dan. vii. 13 seems to indicate a further reference to the casting down of the thrones of the earth to make way for the dominion of the Son of Man, especially of that terrible fourth kingdom which should devour the whole earth, *i.e.* the Roman Empire. (Cf. Hengstenberg on the genuineness of Daniel, p. 166, Eng. Tr.; 'Christology,' vol. iii. p. 79; Pusey, 'Daniel,' pp. 66, 79.)

**30.** *And then shall appear, &c.*] As the former verse repeats in substance the language of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Joel, so the language of the present verse is manifestly founded on that of Daniel vii. 13, and seems to point in the first instance to the event by which that prophecy and the parallel prediction (Dan. ii. 44, 45) were fulfilled. Now Daniel's vision of the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven refers in the first instance to the establishment of Christ's dominion upon earth by the growth of His Church, and the destruction of opposing powers (cf. Dan. ii. 35, 44, which clearly relate to an earthly kingdom; see Hengstenberg, 'Christol.' iii. 30, Eng. Tr.); and, secondly, to the continuation of that kingdom for ever and ever over the Church triumphant in heaven. It seems natural, therefore, to interpret *the sign of the Son of Man in heaven*, not as referring in the first instance to a visible appearance in the sky at the time of the Last Judgment (though this may be a further and future fulfilment), but rather to some indication of the acknowledgment of Christ's dominion upon earth. The *sign* is interpreted by some of the Fathers, and some later expositors of the appearance, of the Cross in heaven as a precursor of the Day of Judgment, and if this be accepted as a probable conjecture (and all interpretations of unfulfilled prophecy must be more or less conjecture) as regards the future and final fulfilment, we may find its immediate type in the position of the same sign in the Church upon earth,—once the ignominious symbol of the punishment of the lowest malefactors,—now the glorious emblem of man's redemption and of Christ's dominion over His redeemed. A visible portent, in the form of a star resembling a sword, is mentioned by Josephus ('B. J.' vi. 5, § 3) as having appeared shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem. But this, even if we admit its reality, seems too early in point of time to be intended here; and the same objection is still more applicable to the other portents mentioned in the same chapter. But perhaps it is not necessary to distinguish between the appearance of the sign of the Son of Man, and the coming of the Son of Man. He appears as a sign that His kingdom is come: "Ipse erit signum sui, sicuti Luc. ii. 12" (Bengel). Exact chronological order in the several clauses is not to be looked for in a passage of this kind; and in Rev. i. 7 the coming of Christ is placed before the mourning of the tribes of the earth.

*then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn.*] In the interpretation of these words we may be guided chiefly by two other passages of Scripture: (1) the words of Zechariah (xii. 10-12), which no doubt occasioned their selection; and (2), those of St. John (Rev. i. 7), which may serve to shew the sense in

*i* 1 Cor. 15. 52. 1 Thes. 4. 16.
| Or, *with a trumpet, and a great voice.*

31 *i*And he shall send his angels |with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

32 Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer *is* nigh:

33 So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, *even* at the doors.

---

which they were understood by the beloved disciple. The evident allusion by St. John to the prophecy of Zechariah is sufficient to shew that the *mourning* spoken of both here and in Rev. i. 7 is either identical with that foretold by the prophet, or at least is included under the prophecy as an antitype and second fulfilment of it. The resemblance between the three passages is far more complete in the Greek than in our version. Zechariah (LXX) says, *καὶ κόψεται ἡ γῆ κατὰ φυλὰς φυλάς*; St. Matthew, *καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*; St. John, *καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*; while our translation varies between *families*, *tribes*, and *kindreds*, between *the land* and *the earth*, between *mourn* and *wail*. Now, while there can be little doubt that the words as employed by St. John refer principally to the last judgment, the words of Zechariah (verse 10) have a manifest reference to the prediction of Joel ii. 28, which was primarily fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost (see on verse 29). Hence we may regard the present passage as having a first fulfilment in relation to that earthly kingdom of Christ which was proclaimed on the Day of Pentecost, and more fully manifested after the destruction of Jerusalem. On both of those occasions there was a *mourning* on account of Christ: first a conscious mourning of the penitent for Him (Acts ii. 37), afterwards a despairing sorrow of the impenitent over the destruction which their rejection of Him had brought upon them. The double meaning of the words *πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς* gives the prophecy a twofold application: first to the judgment of *all the tribes of the land*, the Jewish people, at the coming of Christ in His earthly kingdom; and, secondly, to the judgment of *all the kindreds of the earth*, at the coming of Christ in His heavenly kingdom.

*the Son of man coming in the clouds.*] Here, again, the language of St. John (Rev. i. 7) requires us to interpret these words finally and chiefly of the coming of the Lord to judgment; and yet the prophecy of Daniel (vii. 13, 14; cf. ii. 44) seems to point to an earlier and partial fulfilment in Christ's spiritual kingdom upon earth. (See on verse 29.) May we not here again recognise a first and immediate reference to Christ's dominion of His Church on earth, the object of universal worship in His glory, as He is the object of universal sorrow in His sufferings? (See below on ch. xxvi. 64, xxviii. 10.)

**31.** *And he shall send his angels.*] The angels will be the reapers of the harvest at the end of the world, and will separate the wicked from the just (ch. xiii. 39, 49); and this is no doubt the full and final import of this prophecy. But the same language may also be understood, though less literally, of the gradual formation of Christ's Church on earth by the bringing into its fold of converts from all parts of the world. The term *ἄγγελος* is used in the LXX, as in the corresponding word מלאך in the Hebrew, of ordinary messengers (*e.g.* Gen. xxxii. 3; Numb. xx. 14; Josh. vi. 17), and especially of prophets and priests under the old covenant (Hag. i. 13; Mal. ii. 7). For a similar use in the New Testament, cf. Luke vii. 24, ix. 52; James ii. 25. In all these places the Authorised Version has *messenger*, which is also used as the translation of *ἀπόστολος*, 2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25. In this verse the *angels* may be understood figuratively of the preachers of the Gospel, gathering in Christ's elect into His Church on earth, as the angels of heaven will hereafter gather them into His heavenly kingdom.

**32.** *learn a parable.*] More correctly **the parable**, *i. e.* the phenomenon which the fig-tree exhibits, and which may serve as a visible symbol of invisible things. (See on ch. xv. 15.)

**33.** *all these things.*] *I. e.* all the prognostics of the coming of the Son of Man, probably including all the features of the great tribulation described in verses 21-29. The actual coming as described in verse 30 can hardly be included among the preliminary signs.

*it is near.*] Grammatically, the subject of this preposition is the last-mentioned noun, *summer*; but, logically, it is that which is signified by the summer, namely, the kingdom of God, which is supplied Luke xxi. 31.

**34.** *This generation shall not pass.*] The similar language of ch. x. 23, xvi. 28, seems to require us here to translate the word *γενεά* as meaning *generation*, not, as it is sometimes rendered, *race*, or *people*. The former is the usual meaning (see *e.g.* ch. xii. 39, 41; Luke i. 50, vii. 31, xi. 50; Acts xiii. 36), though the

34 Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.

35 [h]Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

[h] Mark 13. 31.

36 ¶ But of that day and hour knoweth no *man*, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.

37 But as the days of Noe *were*, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.

---

latter is occasionally predominant, as in Jer. viii. 3 (LXX), and perhaps in Matt. xii. 45; Luke xvi. 8. There is no real difficulty in the former interpretation, if we only bear in mind (as I have endeavoured to shew in the preceding notes) that *the whole* of the previous language, from verse 21 to verse 33, has a twofold application, a first and immediate one, to Christ's reign over the Church militant on earth, which may be regarded as in one sense commencing with the destruction of Jerusalem; and a second and remote one, to His reign over the Church triumphant in heaven, commencing from His coming to judge the world. His first presence with His Church *to* the end of the world is emblematic of His second presence *from* the end of the world. (See on ch. xvi. 23.) The neglect of this twofold application has been the stumbling-block of such commentators as De Wette and Strauss, who see clearly that our Lord speaks of His own coming and presence (παρουσία), but overlook or reject His own promise of a first presence with His Church on earth (ch. xxviii. 20). Hence the former maintains that St. Matthew must have attributed to Jesus, as a prediction, the common error of himself and his contemporaries respecting the immediate advent of the Messiah; while the latter goes so far as to intimate that it is not improbable that our Lord himself shared in this erroneous belief.

*till all these things be fulfilled.*] By *these things* we should probably understand all the prognostics referred to in verse 33, together with the actual coming of the Son of Man in His kingdom, which they foretell as near. And in truth the Son of Man did so come. Before that generation had passed away, the Church, which acknowledged Him as her Head and her ever-present Lord, had gone forth conquering and to conquer, gradually but surely making her way to supremacy over the kingdoms of the world; and the destruction of the Jewish temple and nation had made the Lord of that Church known to mankind as He in whom alone could be fulfilled the prophecies which foretold the Messiah's kingdom. (See above on verse 14, and on ch. x. 23, xvi. 28.)

**35.** *Heaven and earth shall pass away, &c.*] These words are not to be regarded as belonging to the foregoing description of the coming of the Son of Man. They are merely parenthetical, intended to express in an emphatic manner the certainty of Christ's words. Compare the use of a similar comparison with a different context, ch. v. 18, and Luke xvi. 17. This verse, therefore, must not be construed as furnishing an antecedent to the next. (Cf. Meyer on verse 29.)

**36.** *But of that day and hour knoweth no man, &c.*] The terms *day* and *hour* must be understood generally of the time, like the *times* and *seasons* of Acts i. 7, not specially of the particular day or hour. These words alone, apart from all other considerations, are sufficient to refute the hypothesis of those critics who hold that our Lord Himself, or the Evangelist speaking in His name, expected an immediate approach of the end of all things. Can it be seriously supposed that this solemn announcement of a time unknown to men and angels means no more than that they knew not the exact day of an event which was to take place within the next few years? Surely the whole force of the words requires that they should be interpreted as contrasting the two events, not as identifying. The emphasis of the contrast rests on the two pronouns. *These* things (ταῦτα) shall take place within this generation; but *that* day (ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη) is known to none but the Father. "*Vero*," [δὲ] says Bengel, "facit ad antitheton, et ταῦτα, αὕτη, *hæc*, spectant in proxima; *illo* [περὶ ἐκείνης, *de illo*], in longinquum." The twofold application of the previous language is now distinctly shewn, and the two events marked off from each other. The earthly kingdom of Christ shall be manifested to this generation; His heavenly kingdom shall come at a time which God only knows. The expression *that day* is elsewhere used, as here, without any expressed antecedent to signify the Day of Judgment. Cf. Matt. vii. 22; Luke x. 12. (Cf. Matt. x. 15; Mark vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 12, 18, iv. 8.) For the important addition made to this verse in St. Mark's account, and in some ancient MSS here, see note on Mark xiii. 32.

**37.** *But as the days of Noe, &c.*] From this point to the end of the chapter, and also in ch. xxv., our Lord describes His last coming to judge the world, which had been brought out as a distinct object of contemplation in verse 36. The time of that judgment is unknown to men, and therefore many will live carelessly and be overtaken by it unawares.

[l] Gen. 7. 5. Luke 17. 26.

38 [l] For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark,

39 And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.

[m] Luke 17. 36.

40 [m] Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

41 Two *women shall be* grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

[n] Mark 13. 35.

42 ¶ [n] Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come.

[o] Luke 12. 39. 1 Thes. 5. 2. Rev. 16. 15.

43 [o] But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up.

44 Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh.

[p] Luke 12. 42.

45 [p] Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?

46 Blessed *is* that servant, whom

---

Verses 37-41 are given in a different context by St. Luke (xvii. 26, 27, 35, 36). See above on verse 26.

**40.** *Then shall two be in the field, &c.*] From this verse to the end of the chapter the discourse proceeds with a figurative description of the final coming of Christ, intended to convey two lessons, (1) that the elect shall be mingled with the rest of the world till the end; and, (2) that there is need of watchfulness, because the time of that coming is unknown. This language is developed into the complete parable in the next chapter.

*taken . . . left.*] *Taken, i.e.* by the angels as one of the elect, verse 31. Cf. John xiv. 3, where the same Greek word is rendered *receive: left, i.e.* excluded from Christ's kingdom. The doom of the rejected is here expressed only negatively: they are not taken; it is stated in a more positive form, ch. xiii. 41, 42, 49, 50. The judgment of both is equally implied, and therefore there is no reason to interpret this verse, with Alford, of the gathering of the elect at the millennial dispensation. Such passages as ch. xiii. 40, 41, 49, 50, xxv. 31, 32, are rather against than in favour of such an interpretation.

**41.** *Two women shall be grinding, &c.*] The task of grinding at hand-mills was anciently, and is still in the East, chiefly performed by women. (See Exod. xi. 5; Isai. xlvii. 2; and cf. Robinson, 'Researches,' vol. ii. p. 181; Thomson, 'The Land and the Book,' p. 526.)

**42.** *Watch therefore, &c.*] The use of the second person does not necessarily imply, as Meyer maintains, that our Lord represents His presence in judgment as coming during the lifetime of the disciples. They, like the rest of mankind, are to be kept in ignorance of that day (verse 36; cf. Acts i. 7): this very ignorance is to be the ground of their watchfulness; and it is equally their duty and that of all men to watch, whether the day is fixed in God's counsels within their own lifetime or not. (Cf. Mark xiii. 37.)

*what hour.*] (The oldest MSS, including D and I of high authority in this portion, have *what day:* but the A. V. is supported by other MSS, and by most of the ancient versions. F. C. C.)

**43.** *But know this, &c.*] This and the remaining verses to the end of the chapter are given by St. Luke (xii. 39-46) in a different context, and apparently as belonging to an earlier period of our Lord's ministry. The extreme difficulty of arranging this portion of St. Luke's Gospel has been noticed before; but with regard to the present passage, the probability seems to be that St. Luke's narrative belongs to a different and earlier occasion, on which similar words were spoken to those recorded here by St. Matthew. (See note at the end of ch. xviii.) This view is perhaps confirmed by the circumstance that the language of a previous verse (Luke xii. 36), "Be ye like unto men that wait for their Lord *when he will return from the wedding*," seems like an earlier form of the thought which is expanded in the present context into the parable of the Ten Virgins. (See Alford on this place.)

**45.** *Who then is a faithful and wise servant, &c.*] The parallel passage (Luke xii. 42) shews that the allusion here is principally to the Apostles, whom He is now addressing, and to those who after the Apostles shall be placed in position of stewards of the mysteries of God. There is perhaps a reference to the *faithful servant* in the language of St. Paul (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2). The same similitude is, however, applicable to every man in propor-

his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.

47 Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods.

48 But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming;

49 And shall begin to smite *his* fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken;

50 The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and in an hour that he is not aware of,

51 And shall [1]cut him asunder, and appoint *him* his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

[1] Or, *cut him off.*

## CHAPTER XXV.

1 *The parable of the ten virgins,* 14 *and of the talents.* 31 *Also the description of the last judgment.*

THEN shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom.

---

tion to the degree of trust committed to him, as is shewn in the next chapter on the Parable of the Talents.

**47.** *he shall make him ruler, &c.*] Probably referring to the history of Joseph. (Gen. xxxix. 4.)

**48.** *My lord delayeth his coming.*] These words seem to indicate that Christ's coming may be delayed beyond men's expectations, and is not therefore announced as immediately at hand. (Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 9.)

**51.** *shall cut him asunder.*] *I. e.* put him to death in this manner. (Cf. 2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chron. xx. 3; Dan. ii. 5; Susanna 55, 59; Heb. iv. 12, xi. 37. See also Herod. ii. 139, vii. 39; Sueton. Calig. 27.) The marginal rendering, *cut him off*, is not warranted by usage, which is also the case with other attempts to substitute a less extreme punishment, such as "scourge," "hew," "lash" (Kuinoel, Olshausen), or "mutilate" (Rosenmüller). The objection that the following words are incompatible with the idea of death is of no force. The image of the parable itself is blended with the reality which the parable signifies; the thought of the human master who can punish his slaves with temporal death passes into that of the Divine Judge, who can punish with spiritual death.

*appoint him his portion with the hypocrites.*] Cf. Rev. xxi. 8. Schoettgen quotes two passages from the Talmud on the punishment of hypocrites: "Every man in whom is hypocrisy is cast into Gehenna;" and there are four classes of men who shall not attain to the face of God's glory—"hypocrites, mockers, liars, and slanderers."

CHAP. XXV.—1-13. THE TEN VIRGINS.

**1.** *Then shall the kingdom, &c.*] This and the next parable illustrate the subject which concludes the last chapter, from verse 36. From that verse, the allusion to Christ's first coming in the establishment of His Church on earth had ceased, and the discourse dwelt on the necessity of watchfulness and preparation for the day of His second coming. The same subject is figuratively contained in the present parable. *The kingdom of heaven* still signifies, as usual, the Church of Christ, but it is the Church at one particular phase of her existence; namely, when her time of trial on earth is about to end, and her triumphant reign in heaven to begin. The opinion of some modern interpreters, who explain the two following parables as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem, is refuted at length by Kuinoel on this place.

**1.** *ten virgins.*] Ten was probably a usual number on such occasions. The company of those who attended on mourners at a funeral was fixed by rabbinical authority to ten at least, and this number seems to have been thought necessary to form a company. It is probable that, whether at funerals or marriages, the number seldom fell short of this, though it may often have exceeded it. (See Lightfoot.) It seems an error to attempt, with many commentators, to discover a spiritual significance in the *virgins*, as if this term denoted those specially devoted to Christ, which necessitates a forced interpretation of the conclusion of the parable. The virgins were the usual companions of the bride, and her proper attendants on such an occasion. (Cf. Ps. xlv. 14.) They are therefore naturally introduced as part of the imagery of the parable.

*their lamps.*] Among the Jews, as among the Greeks and Romans, the bride was conducted to the bridegroom's house in procession, and at nightfall, by the light of lamps or torches. Hence the frequent allusion in classical writers to the nuptial torches. (See

2 And five of them were wise, and five *were* foolish.

3 They that *were* foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them:

4 But the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps.

5 While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept.

6 And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him.

7 Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps.

8 And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are [1]gone out.

[1] Or, *going out.*

---

*e.g.* Eurip. 'Phœniss.' 344; Aristoph. 'Pax,' 1317; Virgil, 'Ecl.' viii. 29; Ovid, 'Her.' vi. 45.) In the present case the *lamps* are not torches, which is the proper signification of λαμπάδες in classical Greek, but lamps in the modern sense, fed with oil from a separate vessel. It is probable that these were more commonly used by the Jews.

*to meet the bridegroom.*] Among the Jews, as among the Greeks, it was usual for the bridegroom with his friends to escort the bride from her father's house to his own, the marriage feast, which concluded the ceremony, taking place at the latter. (1 Macc. ix. 39; Judg. xiv. 10; John ii. 9, 10.) Some commentators suppose that the marriage in the present parable is represented as taking place at the bride's house, but there is no need to suppose such a departure from the usual custom. The bridegroom may be supposed to have gone to fetch the bride; the virgins are to join the bridal procession on its way back to the bridegroom's house, and are waiting at some intermediate place. (See Trench on the 'Parables,' p. 239, Ed. 1860.)

2. *wise .... foolish.*] The whole body of the Church at the time of her Lord's coming will be divided into these two classes—those who are, and those who are not, prepared to meet Him.

3. *no oil.*] They had a small supply in the lamps themselves, but no more when that was exhausted, thus resembling those in the parable of the Sower, who endure for a while, but have no root. Of the spiritual significance of the oil it is not necessary to conjecture more than what the image itself suggests. The flame of the lamp is outward and visible; the oil which feeds it is inward and invisible. The foolish virgins had an outward show of religion, but were deficient in the inward source from which true religion springs, and by which it is maintained. As Abp. Trench says, they are "not hypocrites, not self-conscious dissemblers, much less the openly profane and ungodly; but the negligent in prayer, the slothful in word, and all those whose scheme of a Christian life is laid out to satisfy the eyes of men, and not to please Him who seeth in secret." They are those who neglect to stir up the gift of the Holy Spirit, so that it becomes *quenched* within them. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 19, where the same word is used as here in verse 8, "our lamps are *gone out.*"

5. *While the bridegroom tarried.*] "The tarrying of the bridegroom we may number among the many hints which Christ gave, that the time of His return might possibly be delayed beyond the expectation of His disciples." (Abp. Trench.) See above, ch. xxiv. 48.

*they all slumbered and slept.*] The sleep of all the virgins alike is necessary to the imagery of the parable. The bridegroom is to come suddenly and without notice to all, which would not be the case if some were awake and could see the procession from a distance. There is no need to press this image to a further significance to understand by *sleep*, either death, or those sins of infirmity to which all are liable. The image is satisfied by supposing all to be in a state in which the advent of the bridegroom could not be foreseen. The watchfulness of the wise virgins consisted, not in knowing when the bridegroom was coming, but in being prepared when he came suddenly.

6. *at midnight there was a cry.*] See Ward's 'View of the Hindoos,' vol. ii. p. 29, quoted by Archbishop Trench on this parable, for an interesting account of an exactly similar occurrence at a wedding in India.

*Behold, the bridegroom cometh.*] (Or, *Behold the bridegroom!* The word *cometh* is omitted by the oldest MSS, and some ancient versions. F. C. C.)

7. *trimmed their lamps.*] "Every one at the last prepares to give an account of his works, inquires into the foundation of his faith, seriously searches whether his life has been one which will have praise, not merely of men, for that he now feels will avail nothing, but also of God. Many put off this trying of the grounds of their faith, and hope to the last moment; nay, some manage to defer it, with all the miserable discoveries which will then be made, beyond the grave, even till the day of judgment—but further it cannot be deferred." (Abp. Trench.)

8. *are gone out.*] More correctly, as in the margin, **are going out.**

9 But the wise answered, saying, *Not so;* lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves.

10 And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut.

11 Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us.

12 But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not.

13 [a] Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.

14 ¶ [b] For *the kingdom of heaven is* as a man travelling into a far country, *who* called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.

15 And unto one he gave five [1] talents, to another two, and to an-

[a] ch. 24. 42. Mark 13. 33.

[b] Luke 19. 12.

[1] A talent is 187*l.* 10*s* ch. 18. 24

---

**10.** *to the marriage.*] *I.e.* to the marriage feast in the bridegroom's house. This was considered one of the most important parts of the marriage, so much so, that the word γάμος was sometimes specially used for the marriage feast alone, aud even for a feast in general, as in the LXX. version of Esther i. 5, ix. 22 (the latter in the plural, as here).

**12.** *I know you not.*] *I. e.* I recognise you not as mine (cf. John x. 14). Abp. Trench notices a difference between this parable and that of the marriage of the king's son (ch. xxii. 1-13), namely, that there the man without a wedding garment is admitted to the feast, but afterwards cast out; whereas here the foolish virgins are not admitted at all. The reason, as he explains, is that in the former parable the feast represents the Church militant upon earth, in which the evil are mingled with the good; whereas here it represents the Church triumphant in heaven, into which there shall in nowise enter anything that defileth (see on ch. xxiv. 2, 10). I can see nothing in the parable to support Dean Alford's interpretation that it represents not Christ's final coming to judgment, but the commencement of His millennial reign upon earth, and that therefore the exclusion is not to be considered as final. (Cf. Trench, p. 258, 8th edit.)

**13.** *wherein the Son of man cometh.*] (These words are omitted by the best ancient MSS, including A, C*, and D, and by Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Origen, Hilary, and others. F. C. C.)

14. PARABLE OF THE TALENTS.—This parable differs in many important respects from that of the Pounds (Luke xix. 11-27), which, nevertheless, some expositors (Maldonatus, Strauss, Ewald, Meyer) attempt to identify with it as another report of the same discourse. The latter parable was spoken at Jericho, in the house of Zacchæus, to all the persons then present. This is spoken on the Mount of Olives, to the disciples alone. There ten servants are mentioned; here, three; there the same sum (1 mina = rather more than 4*l.* English) is entrusted to each servant; here, different sums and much larger ones. There the reward is represented under the earthly image of rule over cities; here by the more directly spiritual expression, "the joy of thy Lord." In St. Luke, where the parable is addressed to the people, there is a direct allusion to our Lord's approaching rejection by His own countrymen, and to the judgment which was to follow in the destruction of Jerusalem; in St. Matthew, where the parable is addressed to the disciples alone, it is merely a continuation of His previous discourse regarding His future coming in judgment. This last circumstance is a sufficient answer to those critics who consider it incredible that our Lord should have spoken this simpler parable at a later period than the more complex one in St. Luke. (See Schleiermacher on St. Luke, p. 251, Eng. Tr.) The difference of circumstances under which, and the persons to whom, each was spoken will sufficiently explain the character of the two parables.

14-30. PARABLE OF THE TALENTS.

**14.** *his own servants.*] More exactly **his own slaves.**" "It is necessary that we keep in mind the relation of masters and slaves in antiquity; for that between masters and servants, as it now exists among us, offers no satisfactory explanation. . . . . Slaves in antiquity were often artisans, or were allowed otherwise to engage freely in business, paying, as it was frequently arranged, a fixed yearly sum to their master; or they had money committed to them wherewith to trade on his account, or with which to enlarge their business, and bring in to him a share of their profits." (Abp. Trench.) (Cf. Xenoph. 'Mem.' ii. 7, 3-6; Demosth. 'c. Aphob.' i. 4; Æschines 'c. Timarch.' c. 19; and Greswell, 'Parables,' vol. v. pt. 2, p. 27, *seq.*)

**15.** *five talents.*] The modern use of the word *talents*, to signify mental endowments, is a witness to the natural interpretation of this parable, and a spontaneous confession of man's responsibility in the sight of God for the use of the abilities which God has given

other one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey.

16 Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made *them* other five talents.

17 And likewise he that *had received* two, he also gained other two.

18 But he that had received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money.

19 After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them.

20 And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside them five talents more.

21 His lord said unto him, Well done, *thou* good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

22 He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents beside them.

23 His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

24 Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed:

---

him. Yet though the parable undoubtedly has this general application, we must remember, as Abp. Trench observes, that it was primarily addressed to the Apostles alone, and that some of its details have a peculiar significance as so addressed. Their Master was about to depart from them, "into a far country." He had given them, and was about to give more abundantly, divers spiritual gifts to be employed by them in His work; and these, especially as communicated on the Day of Pentecost, may be regarded as in the first instance signified by the talents of the parable.

**18.** *digged in the earth.*] In Luke xix. 20 the unprofitable servant is represented as having laid up his pound in a napkin. This difference, as Mr. Greswell and Abp. Trench observe, is in keeping with the difference of the two sums. So large an amount as a talent could not have been so laid up. This exact keeping in details is surely an evidence that the two parables are original and distinct from each other; a mere variation in the tradition of the same narrative would hardly have been so consistent.

**19.** *After a long time.*] These words may be added to ch. xxiv. 48 as another intimation that the coming of the Lord is not necessarily to be regarded as close at hand.

**21.** *the joy of thy lord.*] It is hardly necessary to understand these words as signifying a feast in honour of the master's return, of which the servant is invited to partake (De Wette, Trench, &c.). The language passes for the moment from the figure of the parable to the thing signified—the *joy* (Heb. xii. 2) of Christ's heavenly kingdom, into which His faithful servants shall be received—the eternal life promised to the righteous, verse 46. Here, as in the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, the two servants, though the material value of their labour is different, receive the same reward; whereas in Luke xix. 17, 19 the reward is proportioned to the amount gained. Each representation implies a different truth: the first, that eternal life is offered to all alike; the second, that within that life there may yet be various capacities and degrees of reward adapted to each.

**24.** *where thou hast not strawed.*] More correctly, "**whence thou hast not scattered**" (ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας). The original verb is nowhere else in the New Testament used in the sense of strewing seed in sowing, but always in that of dispersing, or scattering abroad. (See ch. xxvi. 31; Luke i. 51, xv. 13, xvi. 1; John xi. 52; Acts v. 37; and compare Matt. xii. 30; Luke xi. 23, which differ only in the use of the simple instead of the compound verb.) The same is also the usual meaning of the word in the LXX. We should therefore interpret it in this place, not as our translators seem to have done, as a mere repetition of the previous clause, but as introducing a new idea, that of driving away the chaff in winnowing. This interpretation

25 And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, *there* thou hast *that is* thine.

26 His lord answered and said unto him, *Thou* wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed:

27 Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and *then* at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.

28 Take therefore the talent from him, and give *it* unto him which hath ten talents.

29 [c] For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

c ch. 13. 12. Mark 4. 25. Luke 8. 18.

30 And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

31 ¶ When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy

---

is confirmed by the change from ὅπου to ὅθεν, "reaping (in the field) where thou sowedst not, and gathering (grain from the floor) whence thou didst not drive away the chaff."

**26.** *Thou wicked and slothful servant.*] The servant is reproved for slothfulness, not for timidity (the word ὀκνηρός will bear both senses, but cf. Rom. xii. 11). Hence the plea that he was afraid of his master seems to be rejected as a subterfuge, and his conduct attributed to its true cause, slothfulness. The lesson of the parable seems not to be directed against those who shrink from a particular work (such as ministry in the Church) through misgivings as to their own unfitness, but against those who through indolence neglect the duties of the station in which they are placed.

*thou knewest.*] This sentence in the original should rather be printed as an interrogation, and rendered "Knewest thou?" It is not an admission of the accusation of the servant, but a question of astonishment, implying, however, that even if the charge were true, the servant was not therefore justified in his conduct. Cf. Luke xix. 22, where the same thought is conveyed in another form by the introduction of the words, "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee," implying that the judgment may be given even on the plea urged by the servant, without admitting its truth. In this latter verse, also, the sentence is in some editions printed as an interrogation, which, however, is not necessary for the sense.

**27.** *to the exchangers.*] More exactly, "**to the bankers**." (τοῖς τραπεζίταις). Cf. Luke xix. 23, *into the bank* (ἐπὶ τράπεζαν). The Trapezitæ were bankers, who received money on deposit and paid interest for its use (cf. Plautus, Capt. i. 2, 83), and also lent money on interest. The *money-changers* (κολλυβισταί) of ch. xxi. 12 represent the same persons, but with reference to a different branch of their business. The argument is a refutation of the servant on his own plea, which his own conduct shews to be fictitious. Had he really been actuated by no other motive than fear of his master's exactions, there was a ready way to meet them without danger to himself. He might have been afraid of the risk of trading on his own account, like his fellow-servants, but he might at least have realised a moderate interest by lending his money to the bankers. His not having done so was an evidence of slothfulness rather than of fear. Mere timidity or caution is not reproved, unless it leads to inaction. Thus interpreting the verse, we may adopt Olshausen's ingenious application of this image: "More timid natures, who are not adapted for independent labour on behalf of the kingdom of God, are now advised at least to associate themselves with persons of greater strength, under whose guidance they may employ their gifts to the service of the Church."

**28.** *Take therefore the talent from him, &c.*] Whether these words will have their special spiritual counterpart at the Day of Judgment, or whether they are merely designed to illustrate the more general truth stated in the next verse, we are not at present permitted to know; but it may be observed that something analogous to this sentence takes place in God's government of the present world—God's gifts are not left unproductive, because one to whom they are entrusted neglects his duty. So far as such gifts are transferable, they are often, as a matter of fact, taken away from him who does not use them aright, and given to another. Thus the kingly power which Saul misused was taken from him and given to David. Thus the kingdom of God was taken away from the Jews, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.

31-46. THE LAST JUDGMENT.

**31.** *When the Son of man shall come, &c.*]

angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:

32 And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth *his* sheep from the goats:

33 And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.

34 Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

[d] Isai. 58. 7. Ezek. 18. 7

35 [d] For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in:

36 Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

37 Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed *thee?* or thirsty, and gave *thee* drink?

38 When saw we thee a stranger, and took *thee* in? or naked, and clothed *thee?*

39 Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

40 And the King shall answer and

---

More exactly, "**But**" when, &c. (ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ), which, however, need not be understood (with Olshausen) as indicating a contrast to the subject of the previous parables. In these parables a warning is given to watchfulness and diligence, in view of the judgment which will come suddenly. In the present verse the only transition is to the features of the judgment itself, disengaged from the images of the parables. It is hardly possible to regard this description otherwise than as referring to the final coming of Christ to judge the world. This, which was the principal meaning of the similar language in ch. xxiv. 30, 31, has now become the sole meaning, the whole discourse from ch. xxiv. 36 having quitted the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem to dwell exclusively on the judgment of which that destruction is the type. The remainder of this chapter describes in direct language the same judgment of men according to their works, which had been figuratively signified in the two preceding parables.

**32.** *all nations.*] The natural interpretation of these words is in their widest signification, to denote all mankind. The view adopted by C. A. G. Keil and Olshausen, and ingeniously defended by Mr. Greswell ('Parables,' v. p. 573), that non-Christians alone are intended, seems inconsistent with the language of verse 34. On the other hand, the interpretation of some of the older expositors (Lactant. 'Instit.' vii. 20), followed by Grotius and Meyer, which limits the judgment to Christians alone, seems to narrow too much the comprehensive language of this verse, and is hardly required by the context, which dwells not specially on the presence or absence of Christian faith and its accompaniments, but generally on moral duties discernible by the light of nature, and required of Christians and others alike. (Cf. Rom. ii. 12; 2 Cor. v. 10.) The subject is discussed at length by H. A. Schott, 'Commentarius in eos Christi Sermones,' &c. Jena, 1820, p. 189, *seq.*, and by Kuinoel on this place.

*sheep . . . . goats.*] The image resembles that of Ezekiel xxxiv. 17, but with a variation according to the difference of application. There the evil and strong rulers of the people are likened to the rams and he-goats, and contrasted with the humbler people, the body of the flock. Here there is no distinction of rank or power; all stand alike before their Judge, distinguished only as two flocks of smaller cattle, *sheep* and *goats*, or rather *kids* (ἐρίφοι). In both passages, however, God's people are represented under the common image of His sheep; and in both Christ is the shepherd; there in His kingdom on earth; here in His judgment-seat at the end of all things. The contrast between sheep and kids probably has no reference to the lascivious nature of the goat, but merely to its smaller value in the eye of the shepherd. (Cf. Theocr. 'Idyll.' v. 25, 26.)

**34.** *the kingdom prepared for you.*] These words must surely refer to Christ's elect (ch. xxiv. 31), and can hardly be interpreted to the exclusion of those who have been His followers in their earthly lives. Olshausen, though his limitation of the judgment to unbelievers alone seems untenable, has an apposite remark on this verse and verse 41. He observes that the words *from the foundation of the world* are found in the former only, not in the latter, and that "Often as the election of believers is represented in the New Testament as eternal and dependent upon the predestination of God, it is never said of the wicked that they are predestinated as such."

say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done *it* unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done *it* unto me.

41 Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, [e]Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

[e] Ps. 6. 8. ch. 7. 23.

42 For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink:

43 I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.

44 Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?

45 Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did *it* not to one of the least of these, ye did *it* not to me.

46 And [f]these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.

[f] Dan. 12. 2. John 5. 29.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

1 *The rulers conspire against Christ.* 6 *The woman anointeth his head.* 14 *Judas selleth him.* 17 *Christ eateth the passover:* 26 *instituteth his holy supper:* 36 *prayeth in the garden:* 47 *and being betrayed with a kiss,* 57 *is carried to Caiaphas,* 69 *and denied of Peter.*

AND it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, he said unto his disciples,

2 [g]Ye know that after two days is *the feast of* the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified.

[g] Mark 14. 1. Luke 22. 1. John 13. 1.

3 [h]Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas.

[h] John 11. 47.

---

**40.** *these my brethren.*] All the sanctified among mankind are called Christ's brethren (Heb. ii. 11. Cf. Rom. viii. 29). By the word *them*, the king is represented as pointing to the general body of those on his right hand.

**41.** *ye cursed.*] Not *of my Father*, as is said of the blessed. The blessing is the gift of God; the curse is the fruit of man's own sin.

*everlasting fire.*] See above on ch. xviii. 8.

**46.** *everlasting punishment .... life eternal.*] It is to be regretted that our translators should have used two different adjectives as renderings of one and the same original (αἰώνιος). Whatever doubts may be raised as to the meaning of this word, it is at least clear that so far as it is applicable to *life*, it is applicable to *punishment* also. The words nearly correspond to the LXX rendering of Dan. xii. 2, ἀναστήσονται, οἱ μὲν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν, οἱ δὲ εἰς διασπορὰν καὶ αἰσχύνην αἰώνιον, where the Hebrew word (עולם) is also repeated.

CHAP. XXVI.—1-5. CONSULTATION OF THE SANHEDRIM.

**2.** *after two days.*] The two days should probably be reckoned as including the day on which the words were spoken, but excluding that of the Passover itself. See above on ch. xxi. 1. If so, the present day is the 12th Nisan. But the events and discourses from ch. xxi. 19 to xxv. 46 can hardly have been concluded till nearly the end of the third day of the week, or Tuesday (see above on ch. xxi. 19), which makes it probable that our Lord's prediction, and the subsequent consultation of the Sanhedrim, must be assigned to the following day, the Wednesday. In this case Friday, the day of the Crucifixion, will be the 14th Nisan, the day of the Passover. See note at the end of the present chapter.

**3.** *the palace of the high priest.*] αὐλή, properly the court, or open space, round which the house was built. (See below on verse 58.) The mention of this place seems to imply that the assembly was not a regular session of the Sanhedrim, but probably only a private meeting of some of its members. It may perhaps be inferred, from ch. xxvii. 6, that the place of meeting was sometimes in the Temple; which agrees with the tradition mentioned by Lightfoot, of the removal of the council shortly before this time from the chamber called Gazith, to a place called "the Sheds," in the court of the Gentiles. This tradition mentions various places of meeting, at different times, but says nothing of the high priest's palace. That the latter place, however, was used for occasional meetings appears both

4 And consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty, and kill *him*.

5 But they said, Not on the feast *day*, lest there be an uproar among the people.

6 ¶ [i] Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper,

[i] Mark 14. John 11. 1.

7 There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head, as he sat *at meat*.

8 But when his disciples saw *it*, they had indignation, saying, To what purpose *is* this waste?

9 For this ointment might have

---

from this passage and from verse 57. (See note on Mark.)

*Caiaphas.*] His original name was Joseph (see Joseph. 'Ant.' xviii. 2, § 2). The additional name of Caiaphas is probably identical with Aramaic Cephas, signifying a stone or rock. (A less probable though more usual derivation is from Aramaic, כְּיָפָא, *depressio.*) He was made high priest by Valerius Gratius, the predecessor of Pilate, towards the close of his procuratorship, probably about A.D. 25, and was deposed A.D. 37, by L. Vitellius, prefect of Syria, after the removal of Pilate from the procuratorship (Joseph. 'Ant.' xviii. 4, § 3).

**5.** *Not on the feast day.*] The words should rather be rendered "**not during the feast,**" *i. e.* not on any of the eight days, including the actual day of the Passover, during which the feast lasted. The numbers which at this time were assembled in the city made an uproar more probable and more dangerous. The treachery of Judas enabled them to avoid this risk.

6–14. THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY.

**6.** *Now when Jesus was in Bethany.*] *I. e.* during His stay in Bethany, on the evening before His triumphal entry into Jerusalem. St. Matthew and St. Mark give no note of the time of this transaction, but St. John clearly fixes it to the above date. As the two former Evangelists do not mention this visit to Bethany, and had therefore no occasion to introduce the incident in its chronological place, it is natural to suppose that it is introduced here as an episode, perhaps from its connection with Judas (though his name is not mentioned except by St. John), and as thus introductory to the narrative of the betrayal. The similar incident recorded by St. Luke (vii. 36) is clearly distinct from the present one. The time, the place, the circumstances, the purpose, of the two events, are all different; yet they are treated as identical by some expositors, ancient and modern, as by St. Chrysostom, in Matt. 'Hom.' lxxx., and others mentioned by Theophylact, as well as by Grotius on this place, by Schleiermacher on St. Luke, and by Ewald, 'Life of Christ,' p. 263, Eng. Tr.

*Simon the leper.*] Probably not an actual leper, but one who had been so; perhaps one who had been healed by our Lord. From John xii. 2, it has been conjectured that Simon was the husband of Martha, who appears to have acted as mistress of the house. Another conjecture is that Simon was the father of the family, who was now dead, though the house was still called by his name. (Theophylact in Matt. xxvi. Cf. Ewald, 'Life of Christ,' p. 239, Eng. Tr.)

**7.** *a woman.*] Mary, the sister of Lazarus. In John xii. 3. The tradition, utterly void of any scriptural foundation, which identifies the "woman which was a sinner" of Luke vii. 37 with Mary Magdalene, may possibly have arisen from a confusion between the first anointing and the second, and between Mary Magdalene and her namesake, Mary of Bethany.

*an alabaster box.*] Literally "an alabaster." This was the common mode of preserving unguents, so much so, that the term "an alabaster," like our own expression "a glass," was transferred from the material to the vessel used for this purpose. See the authorities cited in Greswell's 'Dissertations,' vol. ii. p. 557, 2nd ed. The name was sometimes retained, even when the vessel was made of a different material. See 'Theocr. Idyll.' xv. 114. These boxes usually held a pound (λίτρα = rather more than 11½ oz. avoirdupois), and this quantity is specified by St. John.

*on his head.*] Anointing the head of an honoured guest was not an unusual practice; cf. Luke vii. 46. The frequent practice of feasting with the head anointed (see the numerous references in Greswell, 'Dissertations,' vol. ii. pp. 574, 575) makes it improbable that this part would be omitted, even when, as here (see John xii. 3), the feet were also included. Thus the two accounts are perfectly consistent with each other.

**8.** *his disciples.*] St. John specifies Judas Iscariot as the disciple who made this complaint. It is possible that some of the other disciples may have concurred in it, and that St. John mentions Judas as the leader, and the one whose conduct he had himself noticed.

been sold for much, and given to the poor.

10 When Jesus understood *it*, he said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? for she hath wrought a good work upon me.

11 [a]For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always.

[a] Deut. 15. 11.

12 For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did *it* for my burial.

13 Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, *there* shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her.

14 ¶ [b]Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests,

[b] Mark 14. 10. Luke 22. 3.

15 And said *unto them*, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver.

16 And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him.

17 ¶ [c]Now the first *day* of the *feast of* unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him,

[c] Mark 14. 12. Luke 22. 7.

---

**9.** *for much.*] St. Mark and St. John name the sum as 300 pence or more. Three hundred denarii (about 10*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* English) was an ordinary price of some of the more valuable unguents. Thus the Syrian malabathrum was estimated at 300 denarii a pound (Pliny, 'H. N.' xii. 59), and some unguents are mentioned as exceeding 400 denarii (*Ib.* xiii. 4).

**12.** *for my burial.*] Alluding to the Jewish custom of wrapping up the body with spices and ointments (John xix. 40; cf. Luke xxiii. 56).

**13.** *Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached.*] This amounts to a distinct prophetic recognition by our Lord of the existence of records in which the deed should be related. We may also observe that the word *Gospel* is used here, as generally in Scripture, for the record of our Lord's life upon earth, and of the purpose of that life and death. This is briefly stated by St. Paul as the substance of the Gospel which he preached (1 Cor. xv. 1-6).

14-16. TREACHERY OF JUDAS.

**15.** *And they covenanted with him, &c.*] More exactly, "And they **weighed to him**" thirty pieces of silver. The original word is the same as in the LXX version (Zech. xi. 12), to which the Evangelist evidently referred; and the same English rendering should have been given. The word is probably here used figuratively for "gave him," from the ancient custom of telling money by weight. The verb will also bear the meaning given by our translators; but St. Mark and St. Luke, who are sometimes cited in support of this sense, use different Greek words to express it (ἐπηγγείλαντο—συνέθεντο), and have no reference to Zechariah, and no mention of the actual sum as predicted by him.

*pieces of silver.*] *I.e.* shekels of the sanctuary, the shekel being equivalent to four Attic drachmæ, or about 3*s.* English. (See above on ch. xvi. 24.) The whole sum would thus amount to about 4*l.* 10*s.* English. Thirty shekels of silver was the value placed on a slave (Exod. xxi. 32). "So true," says Hammond, "is that statement of St. Paul, that Christ *took upon him the form of a servant.*"

17-30. THE LAST SUPPER.

**17.** *the first day, &c.*] Legally the first day of unleavened bread was the fifteenth day of Nisan or Abib, commencing on the evening of the fourteenth day, after the paschal lamb was eaten; and the feast of unleavened bread lasted seven days, till the evening of the twenty-first day of the month. (See Exod. xii. 18, 19; xxiii. 15.) Thus Josephus ('Ant.' iii. 10, § 5) speaks of the feast of the unleavened bread as beginning on the fifteenth day of the month, the legal day commencing after sunset. But the day here meant is clearly the fourteenth, being that on which the Passover was slain (Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7), which is also spoken of by Josephus in another place ('B. J.' v. 3, § 1) as the beginning of the feast of unleavened bread. On this day it was usual, though not necessary, to abstain from leaven (see Lightfoot on Mark xiv. 12); and by including it, the feast was sometimes reckoned as lasting eight days (see Josephus, 'Ant.' ii. 15, § 1). A question may arise respecting the part of the day to which the Evangelist's words refer. If to the legal beginning, *i.e.* to the evening following the sunset of the thirteenth, it is possible that the preparation might be made, and the Passover eaten by our Lord and His disciples a day earlier than the usual time. And this is, perhaps, the most natural mode of reconciling the account of the Synoptists with that of St. John. See the two next notes.

Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?

18 And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples.

19 And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover.

20 [d] Now when the even was

[d] Mark 14. 18. Luke 22. 14. John 13. 21.

---

*Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee, &c.*] According to the Mishna (Pesach. c. iv. § 5; cf. Westcott, 'Introd. to Gospels,' p. 316), it was customary in Judea to work till noon on the day preceding the passover (*i.e.* the 14th Nisan), whereas in Galilee no work at all was done on that day, though the schools of Shammai and Hillel differed as to the lawfulness of work on the preceding evening. If this statement represents the practice in our Saviour's time, it would be natural for the disciples who were Galileans, even if they took the more liberal view as regards the evening, to commence their preparation immediately after sunset on the thirteenth, *i.e.* at the legal commencement of the fourteenth, though the Jews of Judea might postpone this task till the following morning. The disciples, in asking the question, may have thus had a view to a passover to be eaten on the following day, though our Lord Himself gave directions for its being eaten the same evening. The ordinary arrangements for the passover included the killing of the lamb in the court of the temple (2 Chr. xxx. 16, 17; xxxv. 5, 6; Joseph. 'B. J.' vi. 9, § 3; Mishna, Pesach. v. 5), and the preparation of the unleavened bread, as well as the making ready for the meal in the chamber. The circumstance that the last alone is mentioned by the Evangelist, seems to imply that the other preparations had already been privately made, as if for a passover at an unusual time.

**18.** *to such a man.*] Πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα. This expression is evidently not the actual one used by our Lord, but a substitution of the Evangelist to denote indefinitely some one who at the time was indicated in a more definite manner. There is no need, however, to assume, with Meyer, that he was indicated by name, and therefore that St. Matthew's account is incompatible with those of the other Synoptists. The person may have been pointed out by other means, such as those narrated in Mark xiv. 13 (where see note); Luke xxii. 10, 11; and it is not improbable, as Theophylact and others have supposed, that the name was purposely omitted, lest the place of meeting should be prematurely known to Judas. (See Olshausen on this place.) The person in question was evidently a disciple, though perhaps unknown to the Apostles; and his room had been prepared in obedience to a previous direction (Mark xiv. 15). This circumstance seems to imply that our Lord had in view an anticipation of the usual time of the Passover, and had made arrangements for it beforehand, though without the knowledge of the Apostles.

*My time is at hand.*] *I.e.* the time of His betrayal and death (cf. verse 45). It is easy to understand the meaning of these words in this place, if we suppose them to give the reason for eating the passover at an earlier hour than usual; but it is difficult to see the purport of them if the passover were to be kept at the usual time, which was known to every one, and was in no way to be affected by approaching events. Compare Luke xxii. 15, "to eat this passover with you *before I suffer*."

**20.** *when the even was come.*] *I.e.* during the evening, not necessarily at its commencement. (Cf. above, verse 6; and Mark vi. 2; John xiii. 2.) The expression, however, seems to denote that the evening had not yet arrived when the question of the disciples (verse 17) was asked. This is not incompatible with the interpretation of that verse given above. The paschal supper was not eaten till after dark. (Mishna, Pesachim, x. 1.) This late hour was perhaps founded on Exod. xii. 8, but was also necessary from the circumstances of the case. The lamb was to be killed "between the evenings" (Exod. xii. 6, where see note), a phrase which has been variously interpreted, but which the expression of Deut. xvi. 6, "at the going down of the sun," appears to limit to a time not far from sunset. According to Josephus ('B. J.' vi. 9, § 3), it was customary to slay the lambs from the ninth hour to the eleventh (*i.e.* from three to five in the afternoon). Allowing time for taking them home and dressing them, the supper could not, as a general rule, have begun till some time after sunset. It would seem natural, therefore, to interpret *the evening* in this place, not of the legal evening, commencing at sunset, but of the natural evening, when darkness had set in, and the hour of supper had arrived. The commencement of this evening would be about an hour after sunset, though the supper may have taken place later. It is probable that our Lord, even supposing that He anticipated the day of the Passover, would observe, as nearly as possible, the usual hour; and thus it is possible that the question of the disciples (verse 17) may

come, he sat down with the twelve.

21 And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me.

22 And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I?

23 And he answered and said, [a]He that dippeth *his* hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me.

[a] Ps. 41. 9.

24 The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born.

25 Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it

---

have been asked at the time of sunset, the legal evening, which was the commencement of the fourteenth day; and that the supper may have been eaten some time later, when the actual evening and the usual hour of supper had arrived.

*he sat down.*] The variations between the different accounts of the Last Supper chiefly relate to the order of the several occurrences, or to the mention by one Evangelist of circumstances omitted by another. There is no real discrepancy, unless we assume that each Evangelist intended to observe a strict chronological order in his narrative, for which assumption there is no evidence. St. Luke differs from St. Matthew and St. Mark chiefly in arrangement, St. John in additions or omissions. St. Luke, however, as Wieseler has observed, gives no notes of time; and his account, which closely resembles that of St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23-25), seems chiefly designed, like it, to give an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, to which some of the subordinate occurrences are afterwards appended, without reference to the time of their occurrence. St. John's narrative bears traces of being supplemental, and chiefly intended to supply, from the writer's personal knowledge, particulars which the other Evangelists had omitted, to the exclusion of those which had already been sufficiently related. The probable order of the events will be pointed out in the following notes.

21. *And as they did eat.*] It is not improbable that the strife for precedence, mentioned only by St. Luke (xxii. 24) should be placed before this verse. It may have originated, as Wieseler suggests, in a dissatisfaction of some with their places at the table, and a consequent dispute concerning their relative nearness to their Master. (See also Ebrard, 'Gospel Hist.' p. 412, Eng. Tr.) Then the supper having already begun (*δείπνου γενομένου*, during supper, not as in our version, *supper being ended*), our Lord may have taken the opportunity of rising from the table and teaching, by washing the disciples' feet, an emphatic lesson of humility both in action and precept. There may be an allusion to this act in the words recorded (Luke xxii. 27), *I am among you as he that serveth.* The mention of His betrayal by one of the twelve will follow after this act and its accompanying discourse, as it is distinctly placed by St. John, xiii. 21.

23. *He that dippeth, &c.*] The language of this sentence is slightly varied in St. Mark, who uses the present participle (*ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος*) for the aorist (*ὁ ἐμβάψας*), but whichever reading he adopted, the sense is probably the same, and to be distinguished from the apparent parallel of John xiii. 26. In the present verse, our Lord does not specify Judas by a sign discernible by the other Apostles. He says that he who **has dipped** (or, in St. Mark's report, he who *dippeth*, *i.e.* generally in this meal, not specially at a particular moment) with Himself in the dish shall betray Him. This may, perhaps, designate (though the interpretation is doubtful) one of those who sat near Him; but it does not point out the individual, as more than one might have dipped in the dish. Thus there is still room for the question of Judas, verse 25. (Cf. Ellicott, 'Hist. Lectures,' p. 325.)

*in the dish.*] Probably the vessel containing the sauce called Charoseth, made of dates, figs, and other fruits, mixed with vinegar, into which the herbs, bread, and meat, at the passover were dipped as they were eaten. This sauce is not enjoined in the Law as part of the paschal meal, but is mentioned in the Mishna as customary, though not strictly obligatory (Mishna, Pesachim, x. 3).

25. *Then Judas, &c.*] This verse, which is found in St. Matthew only, is not inconsistent, as some suppose, with John xiii. 23-28. Our Lord's intention of giving the sop was probably communicated privately to St. John; and its import would, in that case, be unknown to the other disciples, except, perhaps, St. Peter. The question of Judas, as recorded here, was probably an attempt at self-justification on receiving the sop, having reference to the previous words of our Lord, verse 23. Though this question, with our Lord's reply, would point out Judas as the traitor to all who heard them, they did not intimate that his treachery was to be executed immediately; and hence the disciples might still be ignorant

I? He said unto him, Thou hast said.

26 ¶ And as they were eating, *f* Jesus took bread, and [l] blessed *it*, and brake *it*, and gave *it* to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body.

27 And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave *it* to them, saying, Drink ye all of it;

*f* 1 Cor. 11. 24.
[l] Many Greek copies have, *gave thanks*.

---

of the purpose for which he went out (John xiii. 29). It is natural that St. John should confine his narrative to the incident of the sop, in which he had taken a personal part, and which to him was the sign which indicated the traitor. The departure of Judas from the feast, though not expressly mentioned by St. Matthew, is implied in verse 47.

*Thou hast said.*] A Hebrew form of affirmation, of which instances from rabbinical writers are given by Schoettgen on this place.

**26.** *as they were eating, &c.*] The institution of the Lord's Supper, which is not mentioned by St. John, clearly took place during the latter part of the paschal meal, and probably, according to St. Matthew's account, after the departure of Judas. (See above on verse 25.) In St. Luke (xxii. 21-23) it seems at first sight as if Judas was still present, and had not yet been pointed out as the traitor; but it is probable that St. Luke's arrangement is not chronological. (See above on verse 20.) St. John, by breaking off this part of his narrative with the departure of Judas, seems to confirm the inference that the traitor was not present at the institution of the Sacrament. The majority of the Fathers are of opinion that he was present. See Cornelius a Lapide, on verse 20; but the above view is supported by some eminent commentators (cf. Meyer here and Ellicott, *l. c.*), and is at least as old as the so-called Apostolical Constitutions (v. 14).

*took bread.*] The practice of breaking bread, accompanied by blessing to God as the giver, was one of the latest of the preliminary ceremonies observed at the Passover before the actual supper. (See Lightfoot on this place.) It is doubtful whether the breaking of bread mentioned here is identical with the above, or a distinct act, introduced by our Lord towards the close of the meal. The latter is the more probable, as is shewn at some length in Meyer's note on this verse. All that we can gather from the Evangelists is that it took place *as they were eating*, not after the supper was concluded.

*this is my body.*] It would be foreign to the purpose of a merely exegetical commentary to enter on the controversies arising out of these words. As regards their meaning in the present, we can only observe first, that *this* (τοῦτο) is the subject of the sentence, not the predicate, and is most naturally understood as indicating the bread which our Lord gave while He spoke, not as referring to bread in general as the support of life. Secondly, that ἐστιν is only the logical copula of the sentence, which, on the supposition that our Lord spoke in Aramaic, would not be expressed in the original. Thirdly, that *my body* must be understood literally of the actual body of Christ, any other sense being excluded by the additional words *which is given for you*, recorded by St. Luke, and confirmed by St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24). Lastly, that when these words were uttered, the living body of the Lord was visibly present before the disciples, distinct from the bread which He gave to them; and that the words must have been understood by them at the time in a sense compatible with this fact.

**27.** *the cup.*] Rather "**a cup**," the weight of MS authority being against the insertion of the article. Four cups of wine were drunk at the Passover. (Mishna, Pesachim, x. 1. Cf. Lightfoot on this place.) The first was taken at the beginning of the feast, and is generally supposed to be that mentioned, Luke xxii. 17. (But see below on verse 29.) The third and fourth cups were both taken after the conclusion of the meal, the former immediately followed the blessing after eating the paschal lamb, and was usually called the *cup of blessing:* the second part of the Hallel or hymn of praise being interposed between it and the fourth cup. The third cup is generally supposed to be the one mentioned here and Luke xxii. 20, as may be inferred from the title *cup of blessing* (1 Cor. x. 16), and from the mention of the hymn as following. In that case we may suppose that the fourth cup was omitted. Some, however, but with less probability, suppose the fourth cup to be that intended here, as is maintained in Meyer's note on this verse.

*and gave thanks.*] Εὐχαριστήσας. After this example, the custom of giving thanks before the consecration of the elements in the Lord's Supper has always prevailed in the Christian Church; and hence in the earliest writings of the Fathers the term *Eucharist* (εὐχαριστία) is applied to the Sacrament and to the consecrated elements. See Ignatius, 'Philad.' c. 4; 'Smyrn.' cc. 6, 8; Just. Mart. 'Apol.' i. 65, 66; Irenæus apud Euseb. 'H. E.' v. 24, 13; Clem. Alex. 'Pædag.' ii. 2; Tertullian, 'De Præscript.' c. 36. Whether the word is used in this sense in the New

28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

29 But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.

30 And when they had sung an ‖hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives.

‖ Or, *psalm*.

31 Then saith Jesus unto them,

---

Testament is doubtful. 1 Cor. xiv. 16 is sometimes cited as an instance. See Palmer, 'Orig. Lit.' ch. iv. § 15.

**28.** *of the new testament.*] Rather, "**of the new Covenant.**" The reference is to Exod. xxiv. 8: *Behold the blood of the covenant.* This sacrifice, which was an inauguration of the Covenant of Sinai, appears by the use of the blood to have embodied also the belief that remission of sins was necessary for entering into a covenant with God, as the sin offerings showed the same in respect of the renewal of the covenant when broken. Both sacrifices, therefore, partook of the same expiatory character, and are, therefore, united together (Heb. ix. 1-7, 13, 18-22).

*for many.*] See above on ch. xx. 28.

**29.** *But I say unto you, &c.*] St. Luke places these words before the institution of the Holy Eucharist in connection with what is generally interpreted as the distribution of the first paschal cup. Some commentators (even those by no means given to harmonising, such as Dean Alford) suppose that the words were twice spoken. But it may perhaps be doubted whether St. Luke really mentions two cups at all. The leading idea in this part of his narrative is to be found in the words of verse 16, and having mentioned these words as spoken before the Passover, he takes the opportunity of mentioning that similar words were used when He received the cup (δεξάμενος ποτήριον) without necessarily implying that the latter act immediately followed the former. Having thus reported these words by anticipation, it is natural that he should omit them when he comes in order to speak of the giving of the cup after supper (see Luke xxii. 20).

*I will not drink henceforth, &c.*] These difficult words may perhaps be explained by a reference to Luke xxii. 16. Our Lord there declares that He will no more eat of the passover until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God, *i.e.*, until the Jewish Passover shall have received its fulfilment (perhaps rather its *completion*—see above on ch. v. 17), by giving place to the Christian Sacrament in the Church which was to be founded after His resurrection. This Church, though its commencement was not visibly manifested to all men till the destruction of the Temple and the termination of its sacrifices, may be said to have really commenced when the death of Christ fulfilled the typical meaning of those sacrifices, and virtually abrogated them. The periodical celebration of the Holy Eucharist commenced from that time; and it is probable, though not expressly stated, that our Lord Himself after His resurrection partook of it with His disciples. (See Luke xxiv. 30; John xx. 19, 26; Acts x. 41; compared with the evidence of the Apostolic practice of celebrating the Holy Communion at least on every Lord's Day, Acts xx. 7.) No doubt there is also under this image a spiritual meaning in the words, the fulfilment of which will take place hereafter in Christ's heavenly kingdom (cf. Matt. viii. 11; Luke xxii. 30; Rev. xix. 9); but the literal use of the words in the first part of this verse seems to require at least a primary literal fulfilment of the second portion also. Compare Chrysost. in Matt. 'Hom.' lxxii., who interprets the passage literally, nearly as above.

*new.*] Καινόν. The epithets καινός and νέος are both applied to wine (cf. ch. ix. 17; Luke v. 39), but in different senses. The former means wine new in quality or character; the latter, new in time, as of a recent vintage. The former epithet is alone applicable in this place as referring to the new character given to the wine as an element in the Christian sacrament. It is new in its character as the blood of the new covenant; and the covenant is still new, not as recently established, but as contrasted with the old and obsolete covenant which it has superseded. (Heb. viii. 13; cf. Trench 'Synonyms of the New Testament,' part ii. § 10.)

**30.** *an hymn.*] The Hallel or paschal hymn consisted of six psalms, from Ps. cxiii. to Ps. cxviii. The first two, Ps. cxiii., cxiv., formed the first portion, and were sung in the early part of the feast; the second portion, from Ps. cxv. to Ps. cxviii., was sung at the conclusion of the supper. (Cf. Lightfoot on verses 21, 27.)

31-35. St. Peter's Denial predicted.

**31.** *Then saith Jesus, &c.*] The following words to the end of verse 35 seem to have been spoken on the way from the supper chamber to Gethsemane. In St. Luke and St. John the prediction of Peter's denial is narrated before the departure from the

g Mark 14. 27. John 16. 32. h Zech. 13. 7.

[g] All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, [h] I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.

i Mark 14. 28. & 16. 7.

32 But after I am risen again, [i] I will go before you into Galilee.

33 Peter answered and said unto him, Though all *men* shall be offended because of thee, *yet* will I never be offended.

k John 13. 38.

34 Jesus said unto him, [k] Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice.

35 Peter said unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee. Likewise also said all the disciples.

l Mark 14. 32. Luke 22. 39.

36 ¶ [l] Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called Gethsemane, and saith unto the disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder.

37 And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy.

38 Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me.

39 And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou *wilt*.

---

chamber, but without a distinct note of time. It is possible, as Alford and some others hold, that the warning to Peter of his denial may have been given twice. Yet when we consider the indefinite character in St. Matthew of such words as *these*, **at that time**, &c. (see above on ch. xi. 25), it is also quite possible that the language of the present verse may be understood merely as pointing out the occasion on which the words were spoken, without fixing their exact chronological order. The narrative of St. John can hardly be interpreted except as placing the discourse of ch. xiv., and probably also those of xv.–xvii., before the departure from the chamber; and the most probable arrangement, in point of time, of the present verses, will be immediately before these discourses.

*I will smite the shepherd, &c.*] Except in the change of person these words exactly correspond to the Alexandrian text of the LXX version of Zech. xiii. 7. For the Messianic character of this prophecy, see Hengstenberg, 'Christology,' vol. iv. p. 107, Eng. Tr.

**32.** *I will go before you.*] As a shepherd goes before his flock. (See John x. 4.) The sheep scattered by the death of their Shepherd shall be gathered to Him again after His resurrection in Galilee. (Cf. ch. xxviii. 7, 16.)

**34.** *before the cock crow.*] The words as reported here probably give the substance rather than the actual words of our Lord's answer. They indicate the time of the denial, viz., the hour known as "cock-crowing" (Mark xiii. 35), *i.e.* the end of the third watch of the night, or at this season about two o'clock in the morning. The actual words of our Lord are probably given by St. Mark, whose account is fuller and more exact, but in no respect inconsistent with those of the other Evangelists. (See note on Mark xiv. 30.)

**36.** *Gethsemane.*] *I.e.* "oil-press," such as would probably be found at the Mount of Olives, and give its name to the piece of ground (χωρίον) or orchard (κῆπος, John xviii. 1) in which it was situate. The traditional site of Gethsemane is a garden at the foot of the mount on the north-west side, where now stand eight very old olive-trees, the age of which has been estimated by Bové, the botanist, at 2000 years (Ritter, 'Geography of Palestine,' iv. p. 169, Eng. Tr.). Against their antiquity, however, may be urged the statement of Josephus, that Titus cut down all the trees round Jerusalem ('B. J.' vi 1, § 1).

**39.** *this cup.*] The cup of suffering and death which He was about to drink to the dregs, every feature of that suffering being already present to His omniscient vision. For the image see above on ch. xx. 22. Into the import of these mysterious sufferings of the Saviour, how much is contained in them beyond the bodily anguish, in Him who bore our sins in His own body on the tree, we may not curiously inquire; but we may observe the emphatic witness borne by these prayers of human feeling coupled with entire resignation to the Divine will, to the reality of the Lord's human nature, and of His more than human sufferings. The slight variations in the form of this most touching and perfect prayer, as recorded by the three Synoptists, while the substance is the same in all, show how, even in the words of the Saviour Him-

40 And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter, What, could ye not watch with me one hour?

41 Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed *is* willing, but the flesh *is* weak.

42 He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.

43 And he came and found them asleep again: for their eyes were heavy.

44 And he left them, and went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words.

45 Then cometh he to his disciples, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take *your* rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.

46 Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that doth betray me.

47 ¶ And [m] while he yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people.

[m] Mark 14. 43. Luke 22. 47. John 18. 3

48 Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast.

49 And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, Hail, master; and kissed him.

50 And Jesus said unto him, Friend, wherefore art thou come? Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him.

51 And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out *his* hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear.

---

self, it has not been the purpose of the Holy Spirit to enforce supernaturally a mechanical accuracy of language to the prejudice of those human conditions of thought and speech which influence the truest narrative of independent historians. (See above on chap. iii. 17.)

**40.** *What, could ye not watch, &c.*] More exactly "were ye so unable to watch?" (Οὕτως οὐκ ἰσχύσατε γρηγορῆσαι;)

**45.** *Sleep on now, &c.*] Rather "Sleep henceforth" (Καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπόν—cf. 2 Tim. iv. 8; Heb. x. 13). The meaning of this disputed passage may perhaps be explained, and the apparent discrepancy with verse 46 removed, by giving the above meaning to τὸ λοιπόν, and referring back to the touching complaint of the Divine speaker, verse 40. We may then paraphrase as follows: "Henceforth ye may sleep: there is no more occasion that ye should watch with me; the hour of agony is past, and that of betrayal is come. The words "sleep," &c., do not refer to a continuation of the present sleep of the disciples, but to the fact that their watchfulness with Him was no longer required.

46–56. THE ARREST.

**47.** *From the chief priests, &c.*] Judas had probably not previously fixed the exact time for his treachery, he must have obtained the body of men from the chief priests and elders after he left the supper-table. This would make it impossible that they were celebrating their own Passover at the same time. (Cf. Greswell, 'Dissertations,' vol. iv. p. 151.)

**49.** *kissed him.*] κατεφίλησεν, perhaps "kissed him eagerly." The kiss is not mentioned by St. John, who adds some particulars (verses 4-9) which are omitted by the other Evangelists. The natural order of arranging these particulars seems to be first the traitor's kiss and the reproachful reply of the Lord (Luke xxii. 48), then the narrative of John xviii. 4-8, the beginning of which may perhaps be identified with verse 50 of the present chapter, and then the seizure of the Lord by the armed company. (Cf. Krafft, 'Chron. u. Harm.' p. 136; Ebrard, 'Gospel Hist.' p. 420, Eng. Tr.)

**50.** *wherefore art thou come?*] Instead of this rendering some critics substitute "Do that for which thou art come." But if we cannot regard the sentence as a direct question, as is done by Winer, § xxiv. 4, we may supply the ellipse in the form "make known that for which thou art come," and the words will then amount only to a verbal variation of the question in John xviii. 4, which was addressed to Judas as well as to his companions.

**51.** *one of them.*] Namely Peter. See John xviii. 10. The suppression of the name in the earlier gospels may perhaps be owing to the circumstance that they were written

52 Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: [n]for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

[n] Gen. 9. 6. Rev. 13. 10.

53 Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?

54 But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, [o]that thus it must be?

[o] Isai. 53. 10.

55 In that same hour said Jesus to the multitudes, Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me.

56 But all this was done, that the [p]scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.

[p] Lam. 4. 20.

57 ¶ [a]And they that had laid hold on Jesus led *him* away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were assembled.

[a] Mark 14. 53. Luke 22. 54. John 18. 13.

58 But Peter followed him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in, and sat with the servants, to see the end.

59 Now the chief priests, and elders, and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death;

60 But found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, *yet* found they none. At the last came two false witnesses,

61 And said, This *fellow* said, [b]I

[b] John 2. 19.

---

during St. Peter's life. When St. John wrote his fellow-Apostle had probably long been dead, and there was no longer any reason for concealing his name. (See note on Mark xiv. 47.)

**55.** *to the multitudes.*] According to St. Luke "to the chief priests and captains of the temple and the elders which were come to him." To explain this slight variation there is no need to have recourse to the theory of a later form of the tradition (Meyer), nor to that of a misplacement of the words recorded in John xviii. 20 (De Wette). There is not the slightest improbability in the supposition that some of the high priests and elders might themselves have followed their officers to witness and ensure the success of a capture in which they were so interested.

**56.** *But all this was done.*] Rather, "has been done" (γέγονεν). This is probably part of our Lord's own words. The reference is rather to the general tenor of Scripture than to any single passage.

57–68. THE TRIAL BEFORE CAIAPHAS.

**57.** *to Caiaphas.*] The previous examination before Annas is only mentioned by St. John; but its omission by the other Evangelists may be easily explained on the supposition that it was not a judicial inquiry, but merely a preliminary examination of a private character before the assembling of the court, which, as appears from Luke xxii. 66, did not take place till daybreak. Even Strauss admits that the silence of the Synoptists may be thus explained. The difficulties connected with the details of this preliminary examination belong to the text of St. John, and will best be considered in connection with it.

**58.** *palace.*] More correctly "court." See above on verse 3. Oriental houses are still usually built in the form of a quadrangular open court surrounded by chambers. (See note in Robinson's 'Harmony' on this place.) We may suppose that in this court was the entrance to the room in which our Lord was examined before Annas, and also into that in which Caiaphas and the Sanhedrim met. (See notes on St. Mark.)

**59.** *and elders.*] These words are omitted by some of the oldest MSS and recent editors. They are found in many MSS of high authority, and are well supported. F. C. C.

*to put him to death.*] *I.e.* to condemn Him to death, though the execution of the sentence depended upon the Roman authorities (see John xviii. 31).

**60.** *yet found they none.*] St. Mark supplies the explanation. Many came, but none were found available as witnesses, because their witness agreed not together.

**61.** *I am able to destroy, &c.*] It is uncertain how far these false witnesses intentionally misrepresented our Lord's words, which are recorded only by St. John ii. 19. The mere change of person and tense from "destroy" to "I am able to destroy," hardly amount to a wilful falsification. The addition which St. Mark records, *this temple that is made with hands*, for which St. Matthew, giving probably the import and not the actual words,

am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.

62 And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what *is it which* these witness against thee?

63 But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.

64 Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, [c] Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

[c] ch. 16. 27. Rom. 14. 10. 1 Thes. 4. 16.

65 Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy.

66 What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death.

67 [d] Then did they spit in his face,

[d] Isai. 50. 6.

---

substitutes the *temple of God*, are so far a falsification of our Lord's meaning that they point definitely to the building as the Temple intended; but this may have been an unintentional misinterpretation; the words having been so understood by those who first heard them. But if we compare ch. xxvii. 63, it may be inferred that our Lord's predictions of His own resurrection (cf. ch. xvi. 21) had reached the ears of the chief priests, who thus might have been aware of the real meaning of His language concerning the temple. It is possible, therefore, that these false witnesses were suborned to put a sense on our Lord's words which His judges knew that they were not intended to bear.

**63.** *the Christ, the Son of God.*] See above on ch. xiv. 33. It does not appear from this question that the high priest himself believed that the Messiah was to be the Son of God, or used this appellation as recognised in the popular belief, but only that he was aware that Jesus claimed both titles. The union of the two questions here may probably be only an abridged account, as in St. Luke's narrative they are given separately. The latter alone seems to have been the foundation of the charge of blasphemy. (See Wilson's 'Illustrations of the New Testament,' p. 63.)

**64.** *nevertheless.*] The word should here be rendered "further" or "moreover."

*Hereafter.*] Rather "henceforth." (Cf. Luke xxii. 69, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, also wrongly rendered *hereafter*.) The word refers, not to a particular point of time indefinitely future, but to a gradual progress of Christ's kingdom, beginning from the time of His death. (Cf. Hengstenberg, 'Christology,' vol. iii. p. 82, Eng. Tr. See above on verse 29, and on ch. xvi. 28.)

**65.** *He hath spoken blasphemy.*] This charge was made against our Lord, not merely by the high priest on this occasion, but also by the Scribes and by the people on other occasions (see Mark ii. 7; John v. 18, viii. 59, x. 33). On all occasions the charge was connected with his claim to the nature or attributes of God. This claim was also represented to Pilate as a breach of the law involving the punishment of death (John xx. 7). Such a charge could not be founded merely on His claim to be the Messiah, a claim which could not be represented as contrary to the law, and which does not appear to have excited any such indignation on other occasions. (Cf. John x. 24.) It thus appears that the assumption of the title Son of God was regarded as different from a claim of Messiahship simply, and this coincides with the statement of Justin Martyr and Origen that the Jews expected their Messiah to be of merely human birth. See above on verse 63.

**66.** *He is guilty of death.*] We may probably, with Grotius, explain this sentence as a retention of the old form of pronouncing judgment used in the days when the Jewish court had the power of capital punishment in its own hands. The right of executing such a sentence had been taken away from it, according to the usual practice of the Romans, when Judea was reduced to a province, and from that time any sentence pronounced by the Sanhedrim was referred to the Roman governor for execution. In the present instance the charge of blasphemy would not have been recognised by Pilate as a sufficient ground for the exercise of his authority; and accordingly another form of the charge is substituted, that of rebellion against the Roman emperor, by assuming the title of king as one belonging to the Messiah. (Cf. Wilson, *l. c.* p. 9; and on the Power of a Jewish Court, Ikenius, 'Diss.,' vol. ii. p. 517 *seq.*)

**67.** *Then did they spit, &c.*] In St. Luke's account these insults are narrated before the trial, though without expressly stating the time. It is to be observed also that he uses the imperfect tense, apparently as denoting a

and buffeted him; and others smote ¹ Or, *rods.* *him* with ¹the palms of their hands,

68 Saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?

ᵉ Mark 14. 66. Luke 22. 55. John 18. 25.

69 ¶ ᵉNow Peter sat without in the palace: and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee.

70 But he denied before *them* all, saying, I know not what thou sayest.

71 And when he was gone out into the porch, another *maid* saw him, and said unto them that were there, This *fellow* was also with Jesus of Nazareth.

72 And again he denied with an oath, I do not know the man.

73 And after a while came unto *him* they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou also art *one* of them; for thy speech bewrayeth thee.

74 Then began he to curse and to swear, *saying*, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew.

75 And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly.

---

continued series of insults, not a single act. It is unnecessary to have recourse to the hypothesis of a second trial, in order to explain this difference merely in the arrangement of the narrative. St. Luke adds that the persons who inflicted these insults were "the men that held Jesus." This supplies the subject to the sentence, which St. Matthew omits, and St. Mark vaguely indicates by *some* (τινές). There is no need to interpret this as referring to the persons mentioned in verse 66.

69–75. St. Peter's Fall.

**69.** *Now Peter sat, &c.*] The account of Peter's denials is postponed by St. Matthew and St. Mark till after the completion of the account of our Lord's trial before the high priest. This is evidently done for the sake of continuity in the narrative, without reference to the order of time. St. Luke adopts an opposite course, placing the whole account of the denials before that of the judicial proceedings. Their exact position seems to be indicated by St. John, who narrates denials as taking place during the examination (or re-examinations) in the palace of the high priest.

*the palace.*] Rather "**the court.**" (See above on verse 58.)

**71.** *into the porch.*] *I.e.* the passage leading from the court to the entrance. Peter probably withdrew for a short time from the fire, perhaps to avoid observation, but afterwards returned.

*another maid.*] Ἄλλη. St. Luke uses the masculine gender, ἕτερος. St. Mark (verse 69) has **the maid** (ἡ παιδίσκη, not *a maid*, as in our version), which may mean either the maid previously mentioned in verse 66, or the one who had charge of the porch. These slight differences serve to shew the independence of the different narratives, while, at the same time, they ought not to be treated as irreconcilable contradictions. According to St. Mark, the second remark by the maid was addressed, not to our Lord, but "to them that stood by." This might naturally lead to a more direct question from one or more of the bystanders, which is implied in the accounts of St. Luke and St. John. Without pressing these instances too closely, we may at least say that there is no evidence of contradiction, but only of slightly different reports of the same events, which are not incompatible with each other.

**73.** *thy speech.*] *I.e.* his Galilæan dialect. (See Mark xiv. 70.)

---

## NOTE to Chapter XXVI. on the Day of our Lord's Last Supper.

The apparent discrepancy between the different accounts of the day of our Lord's Last Supper may be briefly stated as follows:—

In the account of the three synoptical gospels the Supper is described as a Passover, and appears at first sight to have taken place at the regular time of the Passover, the evening of the 14th Nisan, the first day of unleavened bread according to custom, though not strictly so according to law.[1] The three Synoptists agree in fixing this day, and in giving the name of *Passover* to the Supper

[1] See above, note on verse 17.

itself.[1] If this testimony were the only one on the subject, we should naturally conclude that our Lord ate the Paschal Supper at the same time with the rest of the people, and that He was crucified on the day following, *i.e.* on the 15th Nisan, the first day of unleavened bread in the stricter sense of the term, the day required by the Law to be observed as a Sabbath, and as a day of Holy Convocation.[2]

On the other hand, St. John seems plainly to intimate that at the time of our Lord's crucifixion the Passover had not yet been eaten, and consequently that His last supper with His disciples took place at least one day earlier than the legal time of the Jewish Passover. Those who led Jesus into the Prætorium, we are told, went not in themselves lest they should be defiled, *but that they might eat the Passover*.[3] And again, it is said of the same day, that *it was the preparation of the Passover*.[4] And in agreement with both these statements, the time of the Supper itself is described by the same Evangelist as before the feast of the Passover.[5] According to the natural interpretation of these passages it would appear that our Lord was crucified on the 14th Nisan, a few hours before the time of the Paschal Supper, and that His own last Supper was eaten on the night of the 13th, which, according to Jewish reckoning, was the legal beginning of the fourteenth day. Both these views have been advocated with much ability and learning by earlier and later critics. We may refer especially in support of the former view to the elaborate discussions of Lightfoot,[6] Hengstenberg,[7] Tholuck,[8] and Wieseler;[9] and in support of the latter to those of Ikenius,[10] Greswell,[11] and Bleek.[12] The position of the former class of critics rests mainly on the assumptions: 1st. That the *Passover* of John xviii. 28, does not mean the Paschal Lamb, but the sacrifices of the Paschal week in general, and that in the above passage it is applied to the sacrifice of the first day of the feast, *i.e.* the free-will offering which every Israelite was required to bring to each of the great feasts,[13] and which at the Passover was offered on the morning of the 15th Nisan after the morning sacrifice;[14] and 2ndly, that the *Preparation of the Passover* (παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα), John xix. 14, does not mean the preparation for the Paschal meal, but merely the day preceding the Sabbath (the Friday, as we should say), which fell in the Paschal week.[15] The earlier critics of the latter class, for the most part, endeavour to reconcile the Synoptists with St. John, by assuming that our Lord ate the Passover with His disciples a day earlier than the body of the Jews, or at least than a large portion of that body; but some later writers, such as Neander, Bleek, De Wette, Meyer, Ewald, and even Ebrard in his last edition, are content to explain the discrepancy by assuming an error on the part of the Synoptists, who are supposed to have been misled by an inaccurate tradition, and thus to have assigned to the evening of the actual Passover day the Supper which really took place on the evening before it.

Now, without insisting on the inspired character of the Synoptical Gospels, nor even on the assumption that the writer of one of them was himself an Apostle, and present at the Supper, such an error must be regarded as in the highest degree improbable. The author of the first Gospel, even supposing him not to have been the Apostle Matthew, was clearly a Jew, writing chiefly for his own countrymen; and the Gospel itself must have been written, at the very latest, before the destruction of Jerusalem, while the Temple and its sacrifices were still in existence.[16] The early Jewish converts to Christianity continued to observe the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law, together with the ordinances of their adopted faith; and the Quartodeciman practice, which must have originated with the Jewish portion of the Church,[17] distinctly proves, as will be

---

[1] Matt. xxvi. 17, 19; Mark xiv. 12, 16; Luke xxii. 7, 13, 15.

[2] Exod. xii. 16; Levit. xxiii. 7; Numb. xxviii. 18.

[3] John xviii. 28. [4] John xix. 14.

[5] John xiii. 1. I venture to assume that the supper described by St. John in this chapter is identical with the passover of the Synoptists. This has been denied by some eminent expositors, as by Lightfoot and Bengel, and recently by Krafft, 'Chronol. u. Harm.' p. 125. But that Judas should have been at two separate suppers pointed out as the traitor, and Peter at two separate suppers warned of his approaching denial, are suppositions far more improbable than any difficulties which are involved in the admission of the identity of the two meals.

[6] 'Horæ Heb. et Talm.' on John xviii. 28.

[7] Apud Bleek, p. 109, but see also his comment on St. John.

[8] On St. John, refer to Eng. Tr.

[9] 'Chron. Synops.' pp. 313–352, Eng. Tr.

[10] 'Dissertationes,' vol. ii. 1770, pp. 337–520.

[11] 'Dissertations upon Harmony of the Gospels,' vol. iii. pp. 133–172. Second Edition.

[12] 'Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik,' pp. 33–39. 107–166.

[13] Exod. xxiii. 15; Deut. xvi. 16.

[14] Lightfoot on John xviii. 28. Cf. Wieseler, p. 349.

[15] Cf. Wieseler, p. 309.

[16] See Introduction.

[17] As is maintained by Bleek himself, 'Beiträge,' p. 160.

shown hereafter, that those who observed it regarded the 14th, and not the 15th, Nisan as the day of their Lord's death. To suppose with Meyer,[1] that the Eucharist, from having been originally regarded as the antitype of the Passover, became gradually associated with a tradition which referred its first institution to the legal evening of the Paschal feast, is to imagine a popular delusion which could not have prevailed till long after the community of Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem had ceased to exist, and therefore till after the Synoptists' narrative had assumed its present form. To this it may be added that St. Matthew's narrative of the events of the day following the Supper contains occurrences, as Bleek himself admits, which could not have taken place on the Paschal Sabbath, and which, therefore, a Jewish writer, familiar with the laws and customs of his people, could not have supposed to have taken place on that day.

That an error on the part of the writer of the fourth Gospel is equally improbable, will, we trust, appear in the course of the following remarks. But this will be best shown if we turn from the witnesses to the facts of which they bear testimony; and proceed at once to the consideration of the principal question: namely, was the day of our Lord's crucifixion the 14th or the 15th Nisan—the day on which the Paschal Lamb was slain—or the day of holy convocation which followed?

The preponderance of evidence seems decidedly in favour of the former supposition, which is that which appears to be implied in the narrative of St. John. Apart from the testimony of the Evangelist himself, the following considerations may be urged in favour of this hypothesis:—

1. The language of St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 7) suggests, to say the least, as the most natural interpretation, that the Apostle regarded, not the Last Supper, but the Death of Christ, as the antitype of the Paschal Sacrifice, and the correspondence of type and antitype would be incomplete unless the sacrifice of the Redeemer took place at the time on which alone that of the Paschal Lamb could legally be offered. And when with St. Paul's expression, "Christ our Passover," we compare the language of St. John, shewing how the precept of the Law with regard to the Paschal victim—"a bone of him shall not be broken"—was fulfilled in the person of the Saviour,[2] we can hardly doubt that St. Paul adopted that account of the time, as well as the other circumstances, of our Lord's Passion which was received in the primitive Church, and which was afterwards distinctly embodied in writing in the Gospel of St. John. The very ambiguity of the earlier Gospels, and the impossibility that such an opinion, if erroneous, could have been suggested by them, almost necessitates the supposition that it was the general belief of the first Christians, and it could have become such on no other ground than that of its truth.

2. The testimony of the early Fathers is to the same effect. Justin Martyr, after pointing out the resemblance between the sprinkling of the blood of the Paschal Lamb, and the shedding of our Lord's blood, adds, "For on the day of the Passover ye took Him, and on the day of the Passover ye crucified Him"[3]—words which are perfectly intelligible if we suppose the night of our Lord's betrayal to have been the commencement of the day on which the Passover was slain, but which lose their significance on the hypothesis that the lamb had been slain and eaten before the betrayal and apprehension took place. Irenæus speaks still more plainly: "Moses was not ignorant of the day of the Passion of the Lord, but foretold it in a figure under the name of the Passover, and on the very day which was predicted long before by Moses, the Lord suffered, fulfilling the Passover."[4] So also Tertullian: "The Passover was accomplished on the first day of unleavened bread, on which day Moses had commanded that the lamb should be slain at evening."[5] Clement of Alexandria is still more explicit: "The Lord," he says, "did not eat His last supper on the legal day of the Passover, but on the previous day, the 13th, and suffered on the day following, being Himself the Passover."[6] And finally, Hippolytus of Portus speaks as distinctly: "At the season at which Christ suffered, he did not eat the legal Passover, for He was Himself the Passover which had been foretold, and which was accomplished at the appointed day."[7]

3. The practice of the Quartodecimans, if its true character can be ascertained, will furnish much important evidence in the case. This practice, whatever it be, can be most clearly traced up to Apostolic times, and to the person of one of the chief Apostles. The links in the chain are so few, as to make an error in the tradition almost impossible. Within a century from the death of St. John, Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, being then sixty-five years of age, expressly appeals to that Apostle, who had resided in the same

[1] On John xviii. 28.
[2] John xix. 36.
[3] 'Dial. c. Tryph.' c. 111.
[4] Adv. Hær. iv. 23.
[5] Adv. Judæos, c. 8.
[6] Fragm. apud 'Chron. Pasch' p. 14, Ed. Dindorf.
[7] Ibid.

city, as having observed the 14th day according to the Gospel;[1] and the interval between the Apostle and the witness is filled up by one connecting link — the venerable Polycarp himself, the disciple of St. John and the preceptor of Irenæus, who, as well as Polycrates, testifies to his observance of the same custom. With a tradition so well authenticated as this, it is scarcely possible to doubt that the day recognised in the Quartodeciman practice as that of the Saviour's death, was the day on which He actually suffered.

This brings us to the disputed question, What was the Quartodeciman practice, and what day of the month did it recognise as that of Christ's death? The words of Eusebius on this point are sufficiently clear: "The Churches of Asia," he says, "professing to be guided by an earlier tradition, thought that they ought to observe the 14th day of the moon, at the season of the feast of the Saviour's Passover; being the day on which the Jews were commanded to slay the lamb; holding that it was fitting by all means to terminate the days of fasting on that day, on whatsoever day of the week it might happen to fall."[2] The correct interpretation of this passage undoubtedly is that these churches at the season of the Passover observed the 14th day as that of the Crucifixion, keeping it as a fast until the actual hour of the Lord's death, but terminating the fast at that hour, and concluding with the feast of the Communion, in commemoration of the work of redemption now accomplished. The observances of the day, then, bore a strict analogy to those of the Jewish Passover, the death of Christ being the antitype of the sacrifice of the lamb, while the feast which followed was a commemoration of the redemption of mankind, as the Jewish Paschal Supper commemorates the deliverance of their nation from the bondage of Egypt. It was in connection with a somewhat earlier stage of the Quartodeciman controversy, than that here recorded by Eusebius, that a remarkable testimony to the primitive belief was given by Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, who must not be regarded (with the Tübingen critics) as an advocate of the Western practice against his Asiatic brethren, but rather as himself a Quartodeciman contending against an obscure and perhaps heretical body, whose practice differed from the Eastern as well as from the Western rule. Of the work of Apollinaris two fragments have been preserved, in one of which he says, "There are some persons who, through ignorance, raise contentions about these things, having fallen into a pardonable error; for ignorance does not admit of blame, but needs instruction. And they say that on the 14th, the Lord ate the lamb with His disciples, and Himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread; and they interpret Matthew as saying this according to their apprehension: whence it appears that their notion is at variance with the law; and the Gospels seem to them to be at variance." In the other fragment he says, "The 14th is the true Passover of the Lord, the great Sacrifice, the Son of God, who was bound in the place of the lamb . . . who was pierced in His holy side, who poured out from His side the two purifying streams — water and blood, word and spirit; and who was buried on the day of the Passover, the stone being placed

---

[1] Eusebius, 'H. E.' v. 24.

[2] See Hefele, 'Hist. of Councils,' vol. i. p. 302, Eng. Tr. The words of Eusebius are: *τῆς Ἀσίας ἁπάσης αἱ παροικίαι, ὡς ἂν ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀρχαιοτέρας, σελήνης τὴν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην ᾤοντο δεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτῆς παραφυλάττειν, ἐν ᾗ θύειν τὸ πρόβατον Ἰουδαίοις προηγορεύετο, ὡς δέον ἐκπαντὸς κατὰ ταύτην, ὁποίᾳ δ' ἂν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἑβδομάδος περιτυγχάνοι, τὰς τῶν ἀσιτιῶν ἐπιλύσεις ποιεῖσθαι.* ('H. E.' v. 23.) The Tübingen critics and their followers, as is well known, give a different interpretation to this passage, and endeavour to wrest it into a contradiction of St. John's Gospel, in order to shew that the latter work could not have been written by the Apostle, whose name it bears. But their interpretation will hardly stand the test of grammar or reason. The words *ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτῆς* cannot mean as Dr. Davidson translates, "at the festival of the passover of salvation," i.e. of the Last Supper; but, as the preposition requires us to render, "on the occasion of the feast of the Saviour's passover," i.e. on the festival day of the paschal week. The word *πάσχα* means, not the day of the Last Supper, but the whole paschal season, as is manifest from the subsequent language of Eusebius in the same chapter *τῶν κατὰ τὸ πάσχα νηστειῶν*. And the Tübingen interpretation, besides its violence to the Greek, involves the incredible supposition that the Asiatic churches terminated their fast on the night of the Lord's Last Supper, and commenced a season of festivity with the evening preceding His Crucifixion. Some valuable remarks on the question will be found in an article by Professor Milligan in the 'Contemporary Review,' vol. vi. p. 101.

[3] See Hefele, l. c. p. 311. The words "there are therefore some persons" (*εἰσὶ τοίνυν οἳ*) can hardly be used to indicate the whole of the churches of the writer's own province: they naturally point to a small and unimportant sect; and had Apollinaris adopted the Western practice, he would hardly have laid stress on the 14th day of the month, which was not observed by the Western churches. At the same time, it should be observed, that Dr. Milligan, in the article above referred to, has thrown some doubt on the hypothesis of Watzel and Hefele, that Apollinaris is writing against Ebionite heretics. This question, however, is of minor importance.

on His sepulchre." These two fragments are important, as shewing not only that at the time when they were written (about A.D. 170) the Church in general accepted St. John's account of the day of our Lord's death, but also that the other Gospels (for St. Matthew's narrative is identical with those of St. Mark and St. Luke) are, when rightly interpreted, witnesses on the same side.

4. The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth day, reckoned from "the morrow after the Sabbath;" *i.e.* from the second day of the feast, the day following the Paschal Sabbath (Levit. xxiii. 15; cf. Deut. xvi. 9). Hence it would fall on the same day of the week with the second day of the Paschal Feast. But the day of Pentecost, as is shewn by the manner of its observance in the Christian Church, must, on the year of our Lord's death, have fallen on a Sunday. Hence the second day of the Paschal feast also fell on a Sunday, and the first day the Paschal Sabbath, on a Saturday, coinciding with the weekly Sabbath. If so, the slaying of the Paschal lamb on the previous evening took place on Friday, the day of our Lord's crucifixion.[2]

5. The narrative of the Synoptists itself contains much indirect evidence to shew that the Crucifixion could not have taken place on the 15th of Nisan. This day was observed as a Sabbath (or was itself called the Sabbath, Levit. xxiii. 11, 15), in which no manner of work might be done, except the preparation of necessary food;[3] and the Mishna explains this injunction by the comment that with this single exception, whatever was forbidden on an ordinary Sabbath was forbidden on this feast day also.[4] Among the works thus forbidden, Philo expressly mentions judicial business:[5] and thus the trial and condemnation of Jesus on such a day would have been an express violation of the sanctity of the Sabbath. And even if we suppose that the hatred of the Scribes and Pharisees towards our Lord might have made them willing to commit this profanation, there is, as Mr. Greswell has observed, no reason whatever to suppose the same motive in the case of the two malefactors who were crucified with Him. On a later occasion the intended execution of St. Peter was delayed by Herod Agrippa till after the Passover;[6] and it is as difficult to suppose that the holiest day of the feast could have been selected for the execution of two ordinary malefactors. The same reasoning will apply to other acts performed on the same day—the preparation of the spices for embalming the Lord's body; its removal from the cross and burial[7]—all of which would come under the class of servile works, which were forbidden on the Paschal Sabbath as well as on the ordinary weekly Sabbath.[8]

6. Other evidence to the same effect may be gathered from the same Gospels. The circumstance that Judas obtained a band of men from the chief priests and elders;[9] nay, that some of the chief priests and elders themselves were present when our Lord was apprehended,[10] seems incompatible with the supposition that the whole body of the people were engaged on that very evening in eating the Passover. The appearance on the following morning of Simon of Cyrene "coming out of the country,"[11] is not that of a man who had eaten his passover the night before in Jerusalem, but rather that of one who was now entering the city in order to partake of the passover on the approaching evening. Other indications of the same kind have been noticed in the places where they occur. (See above on verses 2, 17, 18.)

7. All the four Evangelists are agreed in fixing the day of our Lord's death as that of the Preparation (παρασκευή);[12] and three of them expressly intimate that the term has reference to a Sabbath as following the day so called. But then arises the question, What Sabbath is here intended? Is it the ordinary weekly Sabbath, or the Paschal Sabbath, or both, supposing both to fall on the same day? St. John's narrative seems clearly to point to the last of these suppositions. He tells us

---

[1] Fragm. apud 'Chron. Pasch.' Cf. Routh, 'Rel. Sacr.' i. p. 160.

[2] Exod. xii. 16. Cf. Levit. xxiii. 7; Numb. xxviii. 18.

[3] See Scaliger apud Ikenium, ii. 392, and compare note on Levit. xxiii. 15, shewing that the Sabbath is the paschal Sabbath, and that the "seven Sabbaths" mean seven weeks.

[4] Bengel, c. v. § 2. Cf. Bleek, 'Beiträge,' p. 121.

[5] δικάζειν. 'De Migr. Abraham,' i. p. 150. On the practice of the Karaites cf. Rosenmüller on verse 17. It was the general opinion of the Fathers that our Lord ate the Passover before the legal time. See Maldonatus, p. 354.

As regards the supposed violation of Law. Had not Christ as much power to anticipate the Passover by a day as Hezekiah to postpone it for a month, and was not His approaching death as good a reason as the want of purification in the priests?

Note for St. John. Iken. p. 374, 379, 382.

On the two days of the Festival, cf. Ideler, 'Handbuch,' i. 513, apud Meyer.

[6] Acts xii. 4.

[7] Matt. xxvii. 58–60; Luke xxiii. 56.

[8] It may be urged that the sealing of the stone on the day following (Matt. xxvii. 62–66) was a servile work also. But this was performed by Roman soldiers (See ch. xxviii. 12–14), while the other works are expressly said to have been done by Jews.

[9] Matt. xxvi. 47. [10] Luke xxii. 52.

[11] Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26.

[12] Matt. xxvii. 62; Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54; John xix. 14, 31.

that "the day of that Sabbath was a great day;[1] *i.e.* that the Sabbath fell on a day which, for other reasons, was great. What is meant by a *great day* is shewn by the Evangelist in another place, where he speaks of the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles as "the great day of the feast;"[2] an expression which may be further illustrated from the LXX translators of Isaiah (i. 13), where the words קרא מקרא (in our version "calling of assemblies") are rendered by ἡμέραν μεγάλην. A *great day* thus appears to be equivalent to a day of holy convocation, such as were the first and last days of the feasts of the Passover and of Pentecost;[3] and the most natural interpretation of John xix. 31, is to suppose that the great day there spoken of is the day of holy convocation at the beginning of the Paschal week, which in that year happened to coincide with the weekly Sabbath of the seventh day. According to this view the word παρασκευή by itself seems to have a primary reference to the weekly Sabbath following, though the sanctity of that Sabbath was increased on the present occasion by its coincidence with a great day of the feast. But before we accept this interpretation, it will be necessary to examine the two other passages in which St. John uses the same word, namely, ch. xix. 14, in which it occurs as part of the expression παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, and ch. xix. 42, in which it is called ἡ παρασκευὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. As regards the former of these passages we may remark that, although τὸ πάσχα in connection with such words as θύειν or φαγεῖν can hardly mean anything but the Paschal Lamb;[4] yet when it is used as a note of time it is not confined to the single day on which the lamb was eaten, but might be extended to the whole period of the feast. This is manifest from the language of St. John ii. 23, ἐν τῷ πάσχα, ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, and still more from that of St. Luke xxii. 1, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα. (See also Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. ii. 2, τῶν ἀζύμων τῆς ἑορτῆς ἀγομένης ἣν πάσχα καλοῦμεν.) The phrase ἡ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα may thus fairly be understood as meaning the preparation day of the Paschal week, *i.e.* the day preceding the Sabbath of that week. In like manner we may interpret ἡ παρασκευὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, an expression which might very naturally be used by an Evangelist writing at Ephesus for Gentile Christians, among whom the Jewish Sabbath and its preparation were not observed. These expressions may, then, be interpreted in entire harmony with St. Mark's παρασκευή, ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον, and with St. Luke's καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευή, καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε.

But while it may be admitted that the Preparation Day spoken of in all the Gospels had a primary reference to the weekly, rather than to the Paschal Sabbath, and even that the word παρασκευή may be translated, as Wieseler and others maintain, as simply denoting the sixth day of the week—the Friday—such a translation really tells against, rather than in favour of, the argument it is intended to support. For the supposition that the Evangelists specified the day of our Lord's death simply as *Friday*, implies that this was the distinguishing character of the day, that it had no proper sabbatical character of its own, but was simply known as the sixth day of the week, the preparation for the Sabbath following. In that case, however, it could hardly have been, as Wieseler's argument requires, the 15th Nisan, which was itself kept as a Sabbath, but the 14th, which having no such character, might be regarded as nothing more than a preparation for the Sabbath following. The whole narrative implies that the day was not merely a Friday, but a Friday which was so far a *dies profestus*, that not only could preparation be made on it for the Sabbath, but even public executions took place upon it; and the designation of the day simply as παρασκευή or προσάββατον seems to confirm the conclusion to which the general narrative points.

---

With this note the late Dean Mansel brought his work on St. Matthew's Gospel to a close, shortly before his death. The completion devolved upon the editor, who is alone responsible for the notes on the last two chapters, and for the commentary on St. Mark's Gospel, which had been undertaken by the Dean.

---

[1] ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου (ch. xix. 21). The A. V. simply renders, *that Sabbath day was a high day*, which does not give the exact meaning of the original. The epithet Great is not applied to the Sabbath itself, but to the day on which the Sabbath in that year happened to fall.

[2] John vii. 57.

[3] Levit. xxiii. 7, 8, 35, 36.

[4] See Greswell, 'Dissertations,' iii. 139.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

1 *Christ is delivered bound to Pilate.* 3 *Judas hangeth himself.* 19 *Pilate, admonished of his wife,* 24 *washeth his hands:* 26 *and looseth Barabbas.* 29 *Christ is crowned with thorns,* 34 *crucified,* 40 *reviled,* 50 *dieth, and is buried:* 66 *his sepulchre is sealed, and watched.*

WHEN the morning was come, *f* all the chief priests and elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death:

*f* Mark 15. 1. Luke 22. 66. John 18. 28.

CHAP. XXVII.—1, 2. DELIVERY TO PILATE.

1. *When the morning was come.*] The time is marked with great precision both by St. Matthew and by St. Mark. The morning here means the hour of sunrise. St. Mark has "straightway in the morning;" that is, immediately after the second cock-crowing, when the night-meeting in the residence of Caiaphas broke up. This is a fact of considerable importance. The earliest hour at which the Sanhedrim could hold a legal meeting, especially in capital cases, was at sunrise. In the tractate on the Sanhedrim the Talmud states the law, "in capital cases judicial proceedings must be conducted and terminated by day," between the hours of the morning and evening sacrifice.

So far the high priests kept within the letter of the law; but whatever character be assigned to the previous proceedings by night, and to those of this council in the morning, another law of equal importance was now violated. In capital cases sentence of condemnation could not be legally pronounced on the day of the trial. If the night proceedings were merely preliminary to a formal trial, they would have no validity; if formal, they were *ipso facto* illegal. In neither case was the law observed in reference to the second council. According to Hebrew computation of time, it was held on the same day. An accomplished Hebrew historian, naturally anxious to lighten the charge against his countrymen in general, attributes the illegal precipitation of the whole proceeding to the influence of Caiaphas and his colleagues, who belonged to the party of the Sadducees, notorious for cruelty; and he holds that it could not have occurred under a tribunal of Pharisees. (See Derenbourg, 'Histoire de la Palestine,' p. 201.) There can be no doubt as to the character of that high priest and of his predecessors and successors. They were universally hated for their cruelty, luxury, and arrogance, branded by the well-known popular song, quoted from the Talmud by Derenbourg, p. 232, and by Renan, 'Antechrist,' p. 50. Still the Pharisees cannot be exempted. At an early period in our Lord's history they had allied themselves with the Herodian secularists to compass the death of our Lord, and, though not on this occasion specially named by the evangelists, and probably not forming the majority in the Sanhedrim (see Keim, 'Geschichte Jesu,' iii. 353), they certainly did not oppose violent measures; they are included in St. Matthew's "all," and they took an active part in the later proceedings (see verse 62). The evangelists, indeed, are careful throughout to note that the high priests were supported by their usual opponents.

*all the chief priests and elders of the people.*] Comparing this statement with that in the preceding chapter, verses 57, 59, we may infer that the same persons were present at both meetings. There was, therefore, no need to issue fresh summons for a formal council; a short adjournment would suffice. The note on chap. ii. 4, represents the chief priests as being probably the heads of the twenty-four courses. So, too, Fritzsche and Grimm, Lex. It is, however, at present admitted that the term "chief priests" was formally applied to all who had held the office, some of whom were living when this council was held, and were undoubtedly present. "The dignity of the office was so great that it conferred an indelible character (*character indelebilis*) on its bearers, so that when displaced they retained a great part of the rights and duties which appertained to the acting high priest." (See Jost, 'Judenthum,' i. 430; Wichelhaus on St. Matt.; Schürer, 'Zeitgeschichte,' p. 420, and Derenbourg, *l. c.* p. 231, note 1.) The frequent changes of high priests under the Roman governors had not been made simply on political grounds; but since the appointment of Annas, *i.e.* Ananias, A.D. 6, who retained a certain pre-eminence to the end of his life, members of his opulent and ambitious family purchased their nomination, thus securing rank and title, while exempt from onerous duties. No less than eight high priests, between A.D. 6 and A.D. 67, belonged to the family of which Annas was the head. Five were his own sons. A full account of them is given by Schürer, *l. c.* and in the 'Studien u. Kritiken' for 1872, p. 593, f. In addition to those who thus legally bore the title, others nearly connected with the great priestly families are called chief priests, in the vague sense of holding priestly rank, by Josephus. (See 'B. J.' ii. 12, § 6; iv. 3, § 7; 'Life,' 38.) In the Acts of the Apostles, iv. 6, they are described more correctly as being "of the kindred of the high priest."

*took counsel.*] St. Matthew uses this expression five times; it always denotes a formal consultation. St. Mark has a different phrase,

2 And when they had bound him, they led *him* away, and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the governor.

3 ¶ Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and

---

"made" or "prepared" a counsel, or as the word may be properly rendered, held a council. We must certainly understand that this consultation or council was held after the close of the preceding meeting. They had now to determine how the conclusion, to which they had arrived, was to be carried into practical effect. The President could not then legally pronounce sentence of death. It is evident, moreover, that he could not do it even at a regular meeting of the council. At that time, as critics are now agreed, the power of inflicting capital punishment had been taken from the Sanhedrim, whether this was a necessary result of the reduction of Palestine to the state of a province of the empire (A.D. 7), or of a special enactment, which, according to the Talmud, was enforced about forty years before the fall of Jerusalem. Two courses were still open to the Sanhedrim; they might present our Lord to the Procurator as a malefactor, formally convicted in their own court, and ask him to confirm their sentence; or they might charge Him with a breach of Roman law, specially as inciting to insurrection and as claiming royal authority. Their abandonment of the first alternative proves that they were fully aware that their proceedings were illegal; for no Roman governor, certainly not one who feared their enmity and courted their alliance, would have hesitated to confirm a legal sentence on a matter touching the national religion. Their adoption of the second alternative was a criminal act, knowing, as they did, that skilful attempts to bring our Lord into collision with the Roman law had failed. See notes on ch. xxii. 15 f. It was a course likely to result in the death of their enemy. Whatever might be the opinion of Pilate as to the facts, he was not a man who would shield an obscure provincial at the risk of his own position.

The question where this second council was held cannot be decided with certainty. It might have been in the council-hall within the temple, called Gazith ("locus muro cinctus inter montem domus et atrium mulierum;" see Keim, p. 351, note 4), where alone, according to old law, sentence of death could be pronounced. But the council met, not to complete a legal proceeding by a legal sentence, but to settle a plan by which the death of their enemy might be accomplished. It is, therefore, probable that the meeting was held elsewhere, either in the palace of Caiaphas, which appears to have been very near, if not within, the precincts of the Temple, or in the new court, which about that time seems, from Josephus, to have been frequently used, situate outside the precincts; or, as seems still more probable, in a bazaar belonging to the family of Annas, which was within the outer court of the Temple (Keim, iii. 351), and, according to the Talmud, was often used for meetings of the Sanhedrim. Such a place would have a peculiar fitness for the transaction; it was ill-famed for dishonest practices (see Derenbourg, 'H. P.' p. 467), which, but a few days previously, had been exposed and punished by our Lord. There the "viper hissings of the family of Hanan" *i.e.* Annas (the words of the song noticed above) were heard, suggesting the course which was at once adopted in a full Sanhedrim (St. Mark xiv. 1).

**2.** *And when they had bound him.*] Our Lord had been bound when He was first arrested (John xviii. 12), and when He was sent by Annas to Caiaphas (John xviii. 24). That was done simply to secure the prisoner. Now He is bound more formally, and, according to old tradition, with a cord round His neck, if not as a sentenced criminal (Farrar), yet as one to be handed over to the heathen governor on a charge of treason.

*they led him away.*] See note at end of chapter.

*and delivered him.*] The word so rendered has generally a bad meaning. In delivering Him they completed the act of Judas, of whom St. Matthew says in the next verse (not as Authorised Version, following the text. rec. παραδοὺς, has it, "which had betrayed Him," but) "who was delivering or betraying Him" (ὁ παραδιδοὺς, cf. Tisch. ed. 8), an expression apparently chosen to denote an incomplete act. Our Lord, speaking of the President of the Sanhedrim, uses the same verb (John xix. 11); so, too, Pilate (John xviii. 35). It was an act of tradition, extradition, and as affecting the Person of their true King, of treason. Note the usage of the word παραδίδωμι = *trado;* hence *traditor*, traitor.

*to . . . the governor.*] St. Matthew has the title constantly used by Josephus (ἡγεμών, for ἐπίτροπος). Pilate held the office ten years from A.D. 26. The word Pontius is here omitted by old MSS. It indicates the *gens* to which Pilate (a name probably derived from *pilum*, a javelin) belonged, either by descent or adoption.

**3.** *Then Judas.*] "Then" marks the exact time; at the close of the last meeting of the Sanhedrim. The place was certainly within the Temple; see verse 4, and the note on the words "took counsel," verse 1.

*repented himself.*] Of the two words which may be rendered by "repented," St. Matthew

brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders,

4 Saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What *is that* to us? see thou *to that*.

5 And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, [g] and departed, and went and hanged himself.

[g] Acts i. 18.

6 And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood.

7 And they took counsel, and

---

uses that which indicates a change of thought or feeling, rather than hearty repentance. (This distinction has been questioned, but the usage of the New Testament is clear and uniform. Μετάνοια, rare in the Old Testament (LXX) and Apocrypha, always implies "conversion." See Cremer, 'N. T. Gräcität,' p. 444.) Some critics have drawn from this expression the false inference that Judas had not been actuated merely by evil motives in betraying our Lord, but that he had expected His deliverance by a Divine intervention. Others, less unreasonably, but without warrant from Holy Scripture, hold that he might have counted upon an acquittal.

2–10. Remorse and Death of Judas.

4. *I have sinned . . . have betrayed.*] Rather **I sinned, in that I betrayed** (or delivered up) **guiltless blood**. For the word 'innocent,' or 'guiltless,' some MSS read "righteous;" but this misses the special point that, by his instrumentality, the guiltless had been subjected to the penalty for guilt. The reading was probably a gloss for a somewhat rare word; see Fritzsche. The confession of Judas was the first voice that told the chief traitors what would be the verdict of humanity.

*What is that to us?*] The offer came from Judas, ch. xxvi. 15; but the decision to accomplish the death of our Lord by craft had been formally made previously by the council, xxvi. 3, who covenanted with the traitor. The only ground on which they could separate their case from his would be that they did not recognise the guiltlessness of Jesus.

*see thou to that.*] Literally, "Thou wilt see." As for the consequences, they regard thee only.

5. *in the temple.*] The word here used by St. Matthew (ὁ ναός, not τὸ ἱερόν) applies properly to the sanctuary, but it includes the Priests' court; and probably also the second court, to which Judas would have access. This is doubted by Meyer, but supported by Fritzsche, who refers to John ii. 20; Rev. xiv. 15, 17, 18; and especially to Zech. xi. 13. The word is conclusive as to the presence of the Sanhedrim in the Temple, immediately after the judgment.

*went and hanged himself.*] Literally strangled himself; but the word generally denotes "hanging," and is correctly rendered. This is quite reconcileable with the account in Acts i. 18, which implies that he fell headlong, whether from a hastily erected pole or the branch of a tree. M'Clellan aptly quotes a passage from Plutarch, i. 503: "Hanged herself by the neck with a kerchief, which quickly breaking, she gave her throat to the sword." St. Matthew records the act of Judas, with which he was more immediately concerned; St. Peter passes on to describe the visitation of God. By the Roman law, suicides who hanged themselves were not buried; cf. Servius on the 'Æneid,' xvii. 603. The most candid critics (*e.g.* Bleek) admit that the hanging and the headlong fall are not irreconcileable; nor is the bursting of an unburied and putrefying corpse contrary to nature.

6. *the treasury.*] The word *corbanas*, which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, is explained by Josephus as the sacred treasure, the depository of sacred offerings, called Corban; cf. Mark vii. 11. Money given as the price of blood, whether guilty or innocent, could not be accepted as a gift; it would have polluted the treasury.

7. *they took counsel.*] A very short time would suffice, since the members of the Sanhedrim were all present. The purchase of the field was, of course, effected afterwards. The discrepancy with Acts i. 18 may be accounted for, if, as seems probable, the field purchased by the Council was that in which the suicide was committed. But differences in such details, not affecting doctrine or the record of our Lord's own works and words, and not coming under the personal observation of the Evangelists, may be admitted, without detriment to their veracity or inspiration.

*the potter's field.*] A clay-field, situate probably between the dung-gate and the valley-gate, outside the city wall, to the south of Mount Zion. The spot now called the potter's field has at present remains of old pottery work.

*to bury strangers in.*] Either Jews and proselytes who might die at Jerusalem, specially during the great annual festivals (Fritzsche, Meyer), or more generally any visitors.

bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in.

8 Wherefore that field was called, [k]The field of blood, unto this day.

k Acts 1. 19.

9 Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, [l]And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued,[1] whom they of the children of Israel did value;

l Zech. 11. 12.

1 Or, *whom they bought of the children of Israel.*

10 And gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.

11 And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest.

12 And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing.

13 Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee?

14 And he answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly.

---

**8.** *The field of blood.*] Or Aceldama (Hakeldamā), a name retained in the Acts. The necropolis in the lower part of the valley of Hinnom bore the name of Aceldama in the time of Constantine, and is mentioned by Jerome. Renan asserts (giving as a fact a mere conjecture contradicting the Scripture), that the place was so called previously: 'Vie de Jésus,' p. 437, note 2.

*unto this day.*] A notice of some importance, as bearing upon the probable date of the Gospel in its present form. St. Matthew himself might well notice the fact, if, as seems probable, he wrote the Gospel in Greek towards the end of his life, with special reference to the wants of Hellenistic readers.

**9.** On the difficulties presented by the substitution of the name of Jeremiah for that of Zechariah, and by the discrepancies between the text of Zechariah and the citation, see note at the end of the chapter.

11–26. TRIAL BEFORE PILATE.

**11.** *And Jesus stood before the governor.*] St. Matthew thus resumes the account, interrupted by the notice of Judas. The Synoptists deal with the public proceedings only. In the prætorium Pilate examined our Lord privately (see notes on St. John); he now takes his seat on the tribunal in the open place in front of the palace (see note on verse 2).

*art thou the King of the Jews?*] Our Lord was delivered over to the secular power for punishment as a claimant for the throne of David, and therefore as an enemy of Cæsar.

*Thou sayest.*] This is an explicit admission of the fact that He claimed to be the Christ (ὁμολογία, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 13). No other answer could indeed be given; it did not put an end to the inquiry; for although "habes confitentem reum," corresponding to our term pleading guilty, was a maxim of Roman law, it was not applicable unless the whole indictment were admitted. Pilate knew well that the term might mean a spiritual king, a matter which concerned him only so far as it might be connected with insurrectionary movements. The charge was therefore followed up, as St. Mark says and St. Matthew implies, by other accusations, tending to shew that such a connection did really exist; since, as they said, He had attempted to pervert the people, and to hinder the collection of tribute.

**12.** *he answered nothing.*] Pilate expected an answer. He knew the substantial falsehood of both charges, but he would have them met by a reference to well-known facts, that he might have ostensible grounds for an acquittal, which from first to last it was evidently his wish to pronounce. But our Lord was silent. It was not His object to preserve His life. A successful pleading would have frustrated His purpose in coming into the world (cf. John xii. 23-28). The judge and the bystanders needed no such explanation as He might give. The quiet dignity of the Saviour's demeanour has been compared with, but far transcends, that of Socrates, who, as Cicero says, "ita in judicio capitis pro se dixit, ut non supplex aut reus, sed magister aut dominus videretur esse judicum."

**13.** *Hearest thou not?*] Pilate's question indicates irritation. He did not infer guilt from that silence (Keim, p. 371), or adopt the maxim of Donatus, that "silence is a species of confession;" but he was little disposed to undertake the defence of the prisoner. His feeling was probably that of Pliny (ad Traj. 10, 97): "nihil aliud inveni, quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam." (On the authenticity of Pliny's epistle, which has been lately questioned, see M. Boissier, 'Revue archéologique,' Février 1876.)

**14.** *the governor marvelled greatly.*] A pause is thus intimated. Pilate did, in fact, stop the proceedings. Taking advantage of one point in the charge, which named Galilee as the starting-point of our Lord's career

[k] Luke 23. 17.

15 [k]Now at *that* feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would.

16 And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas.

17 Therefore when they were ga-

---

(Luke xxiii. 5), he relegated the affair to Herod, who then occupied the old palace of the Asmoneans, between the Xystus and the Prætorium. St. Matthew and St. Mark give no account of what took place there; it formed no part of the public proceedings: but, like the previous examination in Pilate's residence, it is recorded by an evangelist, who had probably private sources of information (cf. Sanday on the Fourth Gospel, p. 249, note 1). After a brief interval the Procurator again calls together the accusers and the people (Luke xxiii. 13), and makes another attempt to bring the matter to a termination.

**15-26.** This paragraph describes a further stage in the proceedings. Pilate had satisfied himself by previous examination, both private and public, that the charges were partly false, partly irrelevant, as not affecting Roman interests. Herod, who in the mean time had also examined into the matter fully (see Luke xxiii. 9), shared his opinion. Both were reckless of mere right, but neither of them was disposed to make himself an instrument or accomplice in an act which might be expected to cause a popular disturbance, such as would probably have occurred had our Lord been put to death without the consent of the people, who had greeted Him with Hosannas on His entrance into Jerusalem. The expedient now tried was exceedingly skilful. It seemed to present itself spontaneously. It tested thoroughly the feelings of the people. If they chose our Lord the matter was ended; if they rejected Him there would be no danger in complying with the wishes of the Sanhedrim. Immense numbers were now assembled on the place in front of the Prætorium (see note on St. Mark xv. 8). Sufficient time had elapsed to spread the rumour of the previous transaction through every quarter of Jerusalem. All would wish to see the MAN, to hear the sentence, and, above all, to claim their privilege. The whole nation was represented by the multitudes who attended the Passover, and by their leaders.

**15.** *Now at that feast.*] Or, **at festival time**: not necessarily "at every feast," as it is rendered by some (Reuss, M'Clellan), since the Passover is certainly meant. (Cf. John xviii. 39.)

*was wont.*] The origin of the custom is uncertain. The Romans at their Lectisternia, and the Greeks at the Thesmophoria, had a similar custom; and some critics follow Grotius in the assumption that it was introduced by the Romans, by Augustus, or by Pilate himself, as some have inferred from St. Mark's expression (verse 6), which seems to refer to Pilate's own act. It shewed a keen insight into Hebrew feelings, and harmonised with the meaning of the Passover. Schoettgen thinks that there is an allusion to the custom in the Talmud, which, however, speaks simply of promising deliverance to prisoners. No real trace of it, as it is described in this passage, is found in any Hebrew writing. Ewald (vol. v. p. 480, note 1, 2nd ed.) supposes that it may have been ancient; but he gives this as a conjecture, founded on the habit of executing prisoners at the great festivals, and on the meaning of the Passover. So, too, Keim, p. 372, note 3; and Steinmeyer, 'Die Leidengeschichte,' p. 133.

*whom they would.*] St. Mark, "whomsoever they desired," or "asked for." The request was formally made.

**16.** *a notable prisoner.*] The Greek word (ἐπίσημος) implies a certain distinction in crime. Josephus uses the same expression in describing brigands of that time ('Ant.' v. 7, 13; 'B. J.' ii. 21, § 1). The Latins have corresponding terms; a famous, a renowned robber. Thus Cicero, "hominem omnibus insignem notis turpitudinis." Barabbas had been a ringleader in an insurrection, probably that which had been lately repressed by Pilate with extreme cruelty. The variations in the evangelists are interesting. St. Matthew, with his usual conciseness in narrative, says simply that Barabbas was a notorious prisoner. St. Mark refers to *the* insurrection, as one well known; and states, that Barabbas lay bound with the other insurgents who had committed murder in it. St. Luke, writing for Gentiles, has, "for some insurrection and for murder." St. John draws out with great force the main point, that he whom they chose was a robber. Insurrections, at that time frequent, were often led or joined by bandits, who abounded in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; never more numerous than under the dominion of the Romans. (See Hausrath, 'Zeitg. J.' i. p. 309.) The leaders were well known (ἐπίσημοι, as Josephus calls them) and popular. Their names, generally significant, were household words, such as Hannibal, Ptolemy, Amaram, Eliezer. Barabbas might have numerous and influential supporters among the zealots and the populace.

*called Barabbas.*] The name "Jesus" is inserted before Barabbas in a very few MSS (five cursive) and in two versions of secondary authority. The reading, however,

thered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?

18 For he knew that for envy they had delivered him.

19 ¶ When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.

---

is certainly old; it was known to Origen, who approves of its omission, not on critical, but on dogmatic grounds. In a scholion attributed to Anastasius or (wrongly) to Chrysostom, it is said to have been extant in very ancient MSS. Many critics of different schools accept it as probably the original reading (Fritzsche, Olshausen, Meyer, De Wette, Sepp, Ewald, Bishop Wordsworth, Keim, Reuss). It is rejected by Griesbach, Alford, Tregelles, M'Clellan. Tischendorf holds that it may have been taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There are certainly not sufficient grounds for inserting it in the text, but it is easier to account for its omission than for an interpolation, whether intentional or accidental. Barabbas is not, strictly speaking, a proper name; and the tradition, whether founded on fact or on conjecture, has a certain probability.

For Barabbas some would read Bar-rabban; the former meaning father's son, the latter teacher's son. Jerome found this in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The reading Barabbas has far higher authority, and is generally accepted. The word occurs frequently as a surname in the Talmud. (Cf. Wetstein.)

**17.** *Therefore when they were gathered together.*] This expression is important; it implies that there had been an interruption in the proceedings. Pilate has now before him the high priests and other members of the Sanhedrim (see Luke xxiii. 14), and the mass of the people, who came thronging up to the Prætorium (see note on Mark xv. 8); and, taking his seat formally on the throne of judgment (see next verse), he says, in answer to their demand for the release of a prisoner, "Whom will ye that I release unto you?" If the reading 'Jesus' before Barabbas were adopted, it would give a special point to his question: shall it be Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus, who is called Christ?

**18.** *For he knew that for envy.*] Pilate must therefore have expected that the people would ask for the release of our Lord. The envy of the leaders proved that the people in general were favourably disposed towards our Saviour. From the following verses, and from St. Mark's statement (verse 11), it may be inferred that some interval was allowed for deliberation.

**19.** *When he was set down.*] Fritzsche remarks that this notice confirms the account of St. John, xviii. 29, that Pilate conducted the trial, now sitting on the tribunal, now standing or walking, now publicly, now privately, within the palace. The coincidence is minute, but striking.

*his wife sent unto him.*] This episode is peculiar to St. Matthew. It is illustrated remarkably by reference to Roman law and custom. At that time provincial governors were allowed to take their wives with them, but it was regarded as an abuse. Ulpian's judgment runs thus: "Proficisci proconsulem melius est sine uxore, sed et cum uxore potest." Augustus, among other reforms, had strongly enforced the old Oppian law, which forbade wives to accompany his legates to their provinces, permitting only a visit in winter. Under Tiberius an attempt had lately been made in the senate by Cæcina to prohibit this liberty altogether (see Tacitus, 'Ann.' iii. 33). The arguments then used would apply specially to a man like Pilate of weak and dishonest character; and, in such a case as the present, Cæcina and the sterner Roman party would probably have regarded the interference of the wife as a strong instance of undue influence. The Romans might fear that the influence of women would be used on the side of mercy. An instance of such interference is related by the Talmud a few years later, when a noble woman of Cæsarea saved the lives of two Jews, Julian and Pappus (Sepp, 'Leben Jesu,' vol. vi. p. 234). The name of the wife of Pilate, according to an old tradition, was Procla, or Claudia Procula. This might indicate noble birth, membership of the Gens Claudia, to which Tiberius belonged; but it is more probable that she was daughter of a freedman of the emperor, in the same station as her husband. She is canonised by the Greek Church. The statement attributed to Pilate in the spurious 'Acts of Pilate' (see 'Ev. Nicod.' c. 11), that his wife was a devout woman, or proselyte to Judaism, rests on the undoubted fact that Roman women were often favourers of the Hebrews. A few years later some of the highest rank were converts to Christianity.

*Have thou nothing to do with that just man.*] From this it may be inferred that the character of our Lord was already known in the family of Pilate. The wife evidently assumes

*l* John 18. 40. Acts 3. 14.

20 *l* But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus.

21 The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas.

22 Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is

---

some knowledge on his part also, such as may to some extent account for the undertone of feeling, bursting out sometimes in open declaration of our Lord's innocence, which we notice throughout these proceedings. It is noticeable that the Talmud unwittingly bears witness to this incident, applying it, as in many similar instances, to the case of a certain Rabbi. "When king Sapor was about to torture Rabbam, his mother sent to him, saying, 'have nothing to do with that Jew.'"

*in a dream.*] The dream might well be natural; but the early Christians always regarded it as supernatural, most of them believing it to be a divine communication (thus Origen, Athanasius, i. 163; Hilary, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Theophylact); some few (*e.g.* Ignatius, 'Phil.' 4) held it to have been sent by Satan in order to arrest the crucifixion—a somewhat superstitious view, which, however, is noticeable as adopted by Baronius, and found in medieval hymns and dramas of the Passion. The Jews also are represented in the 'Acts of Pilate' as holding this notion.

The dream was not likely to be disregarded by Pilate, as a Roman living in an age and society equally remarkable for want of faith and for puerile superstition—a combination which reached its climax in the family to which the Procurator was specially attached. Augustus paid great attention to all presages (see Boissier, 'La Religion romaine,' i. p. 78), and attached a special importance to dreams: "Somnia neque sua, neque aliena de se negligebat. Ipse per omne ver plurima, et formidolosissima, et vana, et irrita videbat; reliquo tempore rariora, et minus vana. Ex nocturno visu etiam stipem quotannis certo die emendicabat a populo, cavam manum asses porrigentibus præbens." (Sueton. 'Aug.' c. 91.) Julius Cæsar himself was so far influenced by his wife's dream, that on the day of his death he would have remained in his palace but for the advice of Decimus Brutus. (Sueton. 'J. C.' c. 81.)

**20.** *But the chief priests and elders.*] The chief priests took the lead, the other members of the Sanhedrim followed them; both, laying aside their usual scornful demeanour towards the populace, went among them, used the arts of persuasion (St. Matthew) and excitement (St. Mark, see note *in loc.*), appealing to their fears, prejudices, and passions, and turned the current of popular feeling; the contagious frenzy of an excited mob (St. Luke) carried away all resistance, and the nation, probably never represented more completely, made, if not a deliberate, yet a decisive, choice, and demanded the release of Barabbas. The demand to destroy Jesus appears at this point to have been intimated, but not to have been formally expressed, until the second question was put by Pilate. The choice, however, was complete. The people had Jesus before them; but they accounted Him as one "smitten of God," and "turned their faces from Him." He whom they chose was a true representative of the faction which, within a few years, deluged Jerusalem with blood, and brought about the total ruin of the people.

**21.** This question was apparently in answer to the chief priests. Pilate again addresses the people, giving them time for consideration.

**22.** *What shall I do then?*] This is remarkable, since it shews that Pilate made, so to speak, a second offer. He was called upon by the people to release one prisoner only at the festival; but his question implies, that even after their declared preference of Barabbas, he was willing to leave the fate of the Man to their decision. (See Mark xv. 11.) St. Luke, verse 20, observes that he addressed them, wishing still to release Jesus.

*They all say.*] The word "all" is important; it is the answer of the whole assembly.

*Let him be crucified.*] This terrible word shews how thoroughly the evil passions of the people were excited. The demand for crucifixion, a punishment utterly revolting to Jewish feelings (see note on next verse), may have been suggested by the party of Caiaphas (see John xi. 50); but it was always inflicted for the crimes alleged against our Lord.

**23.** *Why, what evil hath he done?*] The repeated attestation of our Lord's innocence is to be observed. It distinctly meets the allegation that He suffered for a breach of law. Pilate challenges the people and their leaders to bring forward any illegal act. He followed up this question by a distinct statement of our Lord's guiltlessness, and with an offer to inflict such chastisement as might satiate their passions (see Luke xxii. 22). But the innocence of our Lord was a matter to which the populace were wholly indifferent. "Their real complaint against Him was pre-

called Christ? *They* all say unto him, Let him be crucified.

23 And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.

24 ¶ When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but *that* rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed *his* hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye *to it*.

25 Then answered all the people, and said, His blood *be* on us, and on our children.

26 ¶ Then released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged

---

cisely this, that He was not dangerous." ('Ecce Homo,' p. 28.) Had He given the answer which the Pharisees expected when they asked Him about the payment of tribute, had He encouraged resistance to the Romans, the mass of the people would have been on His side. Pilate's offer to chastise, *i.e.* to scourge Him, was little adapted to win them over; he must have known little of their feelings to suppose that they would be moved to pity.

*Let him be crucified.*] The cry, twice deliberately and fiercely repeated, shews more than common fury. The Jews held crucifixion in utter horror (οὐκ ἀνασχετόν, Josephus), as an alien and savage mode of execution. Their own mode of execution, by stoning or hanging, was in comparison merciful; it had not the length and variety of physical torture, the wrench on the whole system, the burning thirst, the mangling of hands and feet, nor was it preceded by bloody scourging. The death which the people deliberately chose for their King was that of a slave, of a criminal handed over to their secular and detested rulers.

**24.** *When Pilate saw, &c.*] This indicates a pause; Pilate did not yield until he saw that the demand was fierce and general.

*he took water, and washed his hands.*] The meaning of this significant act is not contested. It proves that Pilate regarded the execution as a murder, without legal justification; but he would throw off the responsibility, and declare himself guiltless of the innocent blood. So the Jews would understand the act; it was in accordance with their own law (see Deuter. xxii. 6, 7). Had the custom been confined to the Jews, Pilate might well have used it, as setting forth vividly the guilt of those who caused the death of our Lord. But as a Gentile Pilate might do it on the twofold ground, (1) that it was customary for a judge to declare himself free from bloodguiltiness before pronouncing sentence of death, generally turning to the east, or calling on the Sun as witness; and (2) that sacramental washing cleansed from blood—a feeling which was regarded as superstitious by thoughtful men (cf. Cicero, "Animi labes nec diuturnitate evanescere, nec amnibus ullis elui potest," 'De Legib.' ii.; and Ovid, "Ah nimium faciles, qui tristia crimina cædis Flumineâ tolli posse putetis aquâ," 'Fast.' ii. 45, 46); but it was deeply seated in the popular mind, and practised in all ages and all countries of the ancient world, not least frequently where the views on which it rested were rejected by the educated classes.

*of the blood.*] This is a Hebrew idiom, noticed by Guillemard, Meyer, and by Fritzsche, who refers to 2 Sam. iii. 8.

**25.** *all the people.*] The whole people were represented by the multitudes at the Passover, but the guilt attaches directly to those only who joined in the cry. The fearful form of execration was common among the Athenians; thus Demosth. 'a. Aristoc., a. Conon,' and Andocides; and also Il. iv. 161, and Ælian, V. H. iii. 43, quoted by Wetstein. It was literally accomplished within a few years, in the case of the nobles who were condemned and scourged on the same spot under Gessius Florus: in the case of the chief priests, the last of the family of Annas being massacred, A.D. 66, in the Temple by the zealots, whose passions were now roused by them; and in the case of the people, of whom multitudes were crucified with every form of ignominious torture by the soldiers of Titus within sight of Jerusalem. See Josephus, 'B. J.' ii.

26–56. THE CRUCIFIXION.

**26.** *Then released.*] Observe the antithesis. Pilate set free the man of their choice, and delivered up (the term used throughout of the criminal tradition of Jesus) their King, with full consciousness of the injustice, in cowardly compliance with their will.

*when he had scourged.*] Scourging was the cruel and ignominious preliminary to crucifixion according to Roman custom ("more Romano," Wetstein), if not enjoined by Roman law (see Steinmeyer, 'Leidengeschichte,' p. 138, note 71) as Jerome expressly states. The order for scourging was given immediately after condemnation in the words "Go, lictor, tie together his hands" ("I lictor, colliga manus"): it is called a prelude of ignominious torture (προαικισμός) by Jo-

Jesus, he delivered *him* to be crucified.

[m John 19. 1.] [1 Or, *governor's house.*]

27 [m] Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the [1] common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band *of soldiers*.

28 And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe.

---

sephus, and "media mors, medium supplicium" by Cicero. The scourging took place in front of the judgment seat, on the same spot where Jews of knightly Roman rank were cruelly scourged before crucifixion under Gessius Florus, A.D. 66; an illegal act, since by law, Roman citizens were exempted from scourging: see Acts xviii. 37; xxii. 25. Scourging was also inflicted in order to extort confession ("flagella quæstionis causâ," Seneca), or as a secondary punishment. From the notices in St. John and St. Luke it is evident that Pilate had still some hope that it might suffice to satiate the passions of the populace—no unreasonable expectation, considering the extreme severity of the punishment. In the presence of the vast multitude assembled in the Forum (see Joseph. l. c.), the condemned person was stripped naked, fastened to a low pillar or stake ("ad palum alligatus," the same apparently which afterwards served for a cross), and then scourged cruelly on all sides (undique) either with the lictors' rods, or, in the case of slaves and provincials, with the scourges, called scorpions (as Isidorus observes, "rectissimo nomine," the "horribile flagellum" of Horace), leather thongs tipped with leaden balls or sharp spikes. The effects, frequently described both by Romans, and by Christians in the accounts of martyrdom, were terrible; not only the muscles of the back, but the breast, the face, the eyes were torn, the very entrails were laid bare, the anatomy was exposed, and the sufferer, convulsed by torture, was often thrown down a bloody mass at the feet of the judge. Such torture, however, in its extreme form, was inflicted chiefly with the intent to wrench from martyrs a renunciation of their Lord or to compel them to betray their brethren. Terrible and revolting as it must always have been, in the case of those who were to be crucified it was not intended to exhaust the strength of the sufferer, who had to bear his own heavy cross; but that was the only limit, and in our Lord's case it went as far as possible, as is evident from His sinking under the cross, and from the short time which elapsed before His death upon it. This is best accounted for by the intention of Pilate, even to the last, to procure the assent of the people to the release of our Lord; it was after the scourging that he gave Him up to be crucified.

*he delivered.*] Execution followed immediately upon condemnation, a short interval only being needed for preparation. The executioners were the Roman soldiers, one exception only to their ordinary proceeding being recorded, when, under Claudius, a tribune, Celer, was handed over to the Jews for profaning the temple. St. Peter refers to execution by heathens in Acts ii. 23 (by wicked men, ἀνόμων, lit. not under the law, *i.e.* heathen). The statement that the sentence was executed by Jews is founded on the spurious Acts of Pilate, and is adopted by some critics; but the passages on which they rely are not conclusive (Luke xxiii. 25; John xix. 16): they refer to the real motive, but not to the official act, of Pilate: he gave Him up to the will of the people, and especially of the high priests, but his own soldiers were the agents, as is evident from the following verse.

**27.** *Then the soldiers . . . took.*] The word "took" corresponds exactly to the word "delivered" (παραλαβόντες to παρέδωκε). The handing over to the soldiers for execution followed the scourging, which was inflicted by the servants of Pilate.

*into the common hall.*] **The palace**, lit. the Prætorium, see notes above on v. 2, and on St. Mark v. 16. The soldiers led our Saviour away from the place in front of the tribunal into the principal court of the palace, where a considerable number, from 400 to 600 men, were always quartered, called by Josephus "the body of forces in the royal palace" (τὸ ἐν βασιλείοις στρατόπεδον). From the expression "the whole band," it has been argued that the Castle of Antonia must be meant; but the whole band does not mean all the garrison, but all the cohort (the "prætoria cohors" of Cicero), thus supplying an additional argument in support of the identification of the Prætorium with the palace as the official residence of Pilate.

**28.** *they stripped him.*] There is no reasonable doubt as to the correctness of this reading. After the scourging, our Lord was again clothed, His clothing was then torn from His bleeding and mangled body by the brutal soldiery. Meyer, however, who is followed by Weiss, reads, they "clothed him," but against the authority of manuscripts, ancient versions, early Fathers, and nearly all critics (see Tisch., ed. 8). St. Matthew alone notices this barbarous and wanton act.

*put on him a scarlet robe.*] Probably a scarlet cloak, worn by the common soldiers. Such mockery was characteristic of the Ro-

29 ¶ And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put *it* upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews!

30 And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head.

31 And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on

man soldiery, whether Italian or provincial. Our Lord had been sentenced as a Pretender to royalty; they put upon Him all the insignia of royalty, the most conspicuous being the purple robe.

**29.** *a crown of thorns.*] This represented either the diadem of Hebrew kings, or the laurel wreath of the Cæsars, which Tiberius wore habitually. This may have been in the minds of the Roman soldiery, bearing especially upon the charge that our Lord incited an insurrection against Cæsar. The thorn of which the wreath was made was probably, as an old tradition represents it, the Zizyphus spina-Christi, the Nubk of the Arabs, which is found in all the warmer parts of Palestine and about Jerusalem. The thorns are numerous and sharp, and the flexible twigs are well adapted for the purpose. (See Tristram, 'Natural History of the Bible,' p. 429.) The representations in the great pictures of the Italian painters probably come very near the truth.

*a reed in his right hand.*] This is expressly mentioned by St. Matthew only. It was an important feature in the symbolism, as representing the royal sceptre, which was not to depart from Judah until the Shiloh came. Still the absence of all reference to prophecy should be noted, as it proves (against Strauss) unconsciousness in the narrator. Even Hase, a cold writer, is moved to say, "There is some comfort in the fact, that even in the midst of the mockery the truth made itself felt. Herod recognises His innocence by a white robe, the Roman soldiery His royalty by the sceptre and the crown of thorns; and that has become the highest of all crowns, as was fitting, being the most meritorious." (Hase, 'Geschichte Jesu,' p. 573.)

*and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him.*] The words imply continued or repeated mockery. In that vast royal hall some hundreds of soldiers passed in procession before Him, each kneeling, each in mockery saluting Him as "the king of the Jews," till as their excitement increased they spat upon Him, following the example of the chief priests (ch. xxvi. 67), and, taking the sceptre from His hand, smote Him on the head repeatedly.

*Hail, King of the Jews!*] Lit. Hail, the king of the Jews; *i.e.* thou who claimest that title.

From St. John we learn that, while Jesus still bore the insignia of royalty, Pilate led Him out before the people, and made a last appeal to their feelings. (See note on St. John xix.)

**31.** The last stage in this part of the proceedings. We must not lose sight of the torture and shame then undergone by our Lord, and wantonly inflicted by the soldiery. Nor should we pass from the scene without noting some points which run through the narrative. First, our Lord's silence. Once only in public, in the presence of the Jews, was that silence broken; it was an explicit recognition of the fact that He was King of the Jews; an explanation of that saying was given in private only to the Procurator, not to the priests or the people, or to Herod, but to one who had a right to know. The Synoptists relate only what was done in public. Secondly, we should remark the total absence of all pretence to legality. The argument is fairly summed up by Hase, *l. c.*, p. 571. "Pilate is to be regarded as the responsible governor of a subject people. In the interest of his sovereign he might order the execution of any one who, as Messiah, excited dreams of independence in this people. Not understanding Messianic ideas, he did not go beyond his official powers. True, the execution of a capital sentence was evidently left to the decision of the Procurator, in order that he might protect those who incurred the enmity of the people as Roman hirelings; but according to maxims of Roman politics, a governor was certainly not called upon to rescue a victim, to whose fate he was wholly indifferent, from the religious fanaticism of a subject people. For this reason, since there could be no question at all of a sentence according to Roman law, Pilate set aside all forms of Roman legal proceedings, and addressed himself exclusively to the assembled multitude, hoping to find in their compassion a support against the persecution of the Sanhedrim. Finding there no response, he openly declared that he pronounced no sentence, but simply, according to the maxim of Roman policy, gave full play to the fanaticism of a superstitious people." To this, however, must be added Pilate's fear of the report which would certainly be made of his proceedings to Tiberius, following up serious charges of maladministration; Reuss says truly, "Jésus fut donc sacrifié à une exigence

him, and led him away to crucify *him*.

[a] Mark 15. 21. Luke 23. 26.

32 [a] And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to bear his cross.

33 [b] And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull,

[b] John 19. 17.

34 ¶ They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted *thereof*, he would not drink.

---

de position, et Pilate se chargea sciemment d'un crime de plus pour faire taire la voix publique au sujet de ses méfaits précédents. C'est à ce crime commis à contre-cœur qu'il doit la perpétuité de l'infamie attachée à son nom." ('Histoire évangelique,' p. 675.) Keim agrees substantially with these writers, proving the strong impression made by the Scriptural account of the feelings and motives of Pilate, and the absolute absence of any legal ground for our Lord's condemnation.

*and led him away.*] The direction in which they led Him depends on the site of Golgotha, which, as will be shewn, was that now assigned to it within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and on the residence of Pilate at the time, which, as seems on the whole most probable, was the Palace near the gate of Jaffa. Had it been, as some critics still hold (*e.g.* Weiss, Tisch.) the castle of Antonia, the direction would have been along the Via Dolorosa, from east to west. From the palace the distance was some 500 or 600 yards eastward to the gate Gennath, then outside the wall, about twice the distance northwards to Golgotha. The entire distance, less than one-third of a mile, would be nearly the same from both points.

From the palace to the gate of the city our Saviour bore His own cross, according to the savage custom which had been lately introduced by the Romans. (See Keim's note, p. 397 seq., who quotes Plautus, Plutarch, Artemidorus.) The tablet, with the inscription afterwards affixed to the cross, was borne before Him. The procession, headed by the Centurion, who had charge of the execution, consisted of the soldiers, four for each cross, and of the two malefactors condemned to the same death. It was followed doubtless by numbers of those who had demanded His crucifixion, foremost among them the chief priests and members of the Sanhedrim, of whose presence we read further on, verse 41; unless, indeed, they returned for a short interval to the Temple. Some pitying spectators watched the proceeding (see St. Luke xxiii. 27).

32. *And as they came out.*] *I.e.* from the gate of the city, not from the palace of Pilate, for they met Simon coming out of the country (see St. Mark). Our Lord bore the cross until He was "without the gate" (Heb. xiii. 12).

*a man of Cyrene, Simon by name.*] It is evident that our Lord then sank under the weight of the Cross; hence St. Mark uses a different word; up to that time they led Him, then they bore Him. (See note on Mark v. 22.) The soldiers were not likely to impress any of the Jews there present as witnesses of an execution which they had called for; but meeting a man coming into the city, and therefore not a party to the proceedings—probably recognised by his dress and appearance as a stranger to Jerusalem—they forced him to render a service which has associated for ever his name with the Crucifixion. Whether he was known to any present as sympathising with our Lord's teaching is uncertain, but that he became a Christian is more than probable (see note on Mark xv. 21). Bishop Ellicott adopts Lightfoot's conjecture that he may have been coming from his work in the country, *ligno onustus*; but this is improbable: his position appears rather to have been that of a merchant.

33. *A place called Golgotha, &c.*] On the name and site see note at end of chapter.

34. *vinegar . . . mingled with gall.*] Or "wine" mingled with gall: see note below. The object of the draught so tendered was to dull the sense of pain; or, it may be, to subdue the convulsive struggles of sufferers during the process of crucifixion. The custom, however, was Jewish, not originally Roman. A strong narcotic was usually provided by compassionate Hebrew women, with the express intention of producing partial unconsciousness, *ut turbaretur intellectus*. The soldiers were usually bribed to administer such a potion. In the present instance they would be aware of the feelings of the governor's wife, and they were under the command of a centurion, whose mind was probably already affected by our Lord's demeanour. But our Lord, after tasting it, thus finding that it was not merely given to appease the burning thirst, for which He afterwards accepted alleviation, but that it was strongly drugged, declined it; as even the most sceptical admit, and as Christians never doubted, because, to use Keim's words, "He would look death in the face with untroubled spirit;" because He would give His followers in all times the highest lesson as to the spirit in which the cup of suffering should be received, with calm clear consciousness and willing submission to God's will.

35 And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, [c] They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

[c] Ps. 22. 18.

36 And sitting down they watched him there;

35. *And they crucified him.*] Crosses were of three forms, the X, commonly called St. Andrew's cross, the T, and the +, the last of which was certainly used in this case, the short part above the head serving for the tablet, with its inscription. The middle pole had a short projection supporting the body, lest the hands and feet should give way, called πῆγμα, cornu, or sedile, frequently noticed by the early Fathers (Justin M. c. Tryph. 91; Irenæus, ii. 24, § 4; Tertullian adv. Nat. ii.). When the cross was erected previously, the sufferer was raised and placed on this projection, and his hands and feet (see further on) were then nailed; but when it was borne, the body was stretched out upon it, the nails driven in, and the cross afterwards raised and fixed in its place. The hands, as all admit, were always nailed, except by the Egyptians, who simply bound them; the feet were also pierced, a point formerly contested, but now generally admitted (*e.g.* by Bleek, Keim, and by Hase, who notices it as *one* instance—he might have added among many—where old tradition has been thoroughly confirmed by late investigations); see, too, Marquardt, 'Rom. Ant.' and Sepp. Whether both feet were pierced by one great nail is doubtful (the oldest crucifixes have four nails), but seems probable. Each terrible detail must be noted in order to understand the kind and amount of the sufferings inflicted by this, the most savage and brutal of all punishments, combining every form of bodily torture, borne with full living consciousness by Incarnate Love.

One indignity was omitted: the head was not covered, the mouth not gagged, as was sometimes done (cf. Tac. 'Ann.' iv. 70); but we may not attribute this to relenting. The murderers would "look on Him whom they pierced," and witness His dying agony.

*and parted his garments.*] The robe and tunic were removed previously; but neither Jewish, nor even Roman custom tolerated entire nakedness. In stoning, the Jews enjoined a linen girdle; the Mishna (see Sepp. p. 330) expressly orders an apron in crucifixion, such as formed part of the costume of the high priest, and is represented on Byzantine crucifixes. The Romans were not likely to offer a gratuitous insult to the people, whom they intended to gratify by the execution. Little weight can be attached to the spurious Acts of Pilate; but the statement there, that "they girded Him with a linen cloth," may rest on old tradition, and shews at least the general feeling and belief among Christians. Some early Fathers, indeed, speak of nakedness in strong terms, which may, however, be understood to refer to the absence of usual clothing; γυμνὸς would be used by Greeks in that case; cf. John xxi. 7, and see the passages quoted by Cornelius a Lapide *in loc.*, Ambrose on St. Luke: "Talis ascendit in crucem quales nos auctore Deo natura formavit." So, too, Origen and Athanasius.

All the evangelists notice both the partition and the casting of lots. St. John (verse 23) alone explains why both acts were done, when one might seem to exclude the other. The garments of the crucified by Roman custom belonged to the executioners; in this case, to the four soldiers who crucified our Lord: each cross was in the charge of a quaternion. Casting of lots, an universal custom, not condemned by Holy Scripture, was specially characteristic of the Roman soldiery. (Cf. Virg. 'Æn.' v. 490, 491.)

The circumstances recorded by St. Matthew are noted by the earliest Christian writers: Barn. Ep. 7; Justin M. c. Tr. p. 332 B.C.; Ap. i. p. 76 c; a passage of great importance, more especially for his reference to the "Acts of Pilate;" "and that this did so take place you may learn from the account of the acts under Pontius Pilate." That these Acts were not identical with the so-called Gospel of Nicodemus has been argued by Lipsius (against Tischendorf); but that they did exist, and were known to Justin M., Tertullian, and Eusebius—a fact denied by Lipsius—is certain, and admitted unreservedly by such critics as Hilgenfeld, 'Zeitschr. f. w. Theologie,' 1871; and Keim.

*that it might be fulfilled.*] The quotation is quite in accordance with St. Matthew's practice, ever careful to note the fulfilment of prophecy; and throughout this account his mind is full of the twenty-second Psalm, to which his references are frequent and distinct; but it is not accepted by the majority of critics, being found only in one uncial manuscript. It is far more easy to account for the insertion from St. John's Gospel, see marg. ref., than for so general an omission. As to the facts, Hase, 'G. J.' p. 576, says briefly and truly, "the partition and allotment of the garments, especially in the definite form related by St. John, is, indeed, connected with prophecy; but in itself legal, and, under the circumstances, natural (sach-gemäss)."

36. *they watched him there.*] The soldiers remained close to the cross, being responsible

37 And set up over his head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

38 Then were there two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand, and another on the left.

39 ¶ And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads,

40 And saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest *it* in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.

41 Likewise also the chief priests mocking *him*, with the scribes and elders, said,

42 He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of

---

for the execution under pain of death, in order to prevent any near approach. Four quaternions were sometimes appointed, relieving each other every three hours (see Acts xii. 4). The centurion in command remained through the day. The expression 'watched,' or 'kept watch' here used is technical: "miles qui crucem asservabat."

**37.** *his accusation.*] This was customary in the case of remarkable prisoners. It was written on a white tablet (called σανίς, or λεύκωμα), which was borne before the prisoner, and placed over his head when the cross was erected (see note on v. 31). Bilingual and trilingual inscriptions were common throughout the East.

The differences in the form of the inscription may be accounted for by the three languages in which it was written. St. Mark has the shortest form, with the characteristic brevity of the Latin, "Rex Judæorum;" on St. Luke and St. John see notes. St. Matthew naturally presents the Aramaic form, which is given in the Peshito version. The name of the crucified was frequently written; thus Euseb., 'H. E.' v. 1, "the tablet was borne before him, on which it was written, 'this is Attalus the Christian.'" This was, indeed, an ancient and very general custom, found in all the inscriptions at Behistan. In this case the inscription is of great importance, shewing the only reason assigned for our Lord's condemnation. The request of the chief priests related by St. John (xix. 21) was natural, and the refusal by Pilate strangely significant. Over each of the condemned chiefs at Behistan a word is added, implying a false claim: thus, "This is Gometes. He lied, saying, 'I am king.'" The Christian Fathers were neither weak nor superstitious in noticing Pilate's last formal if unconscious testimony to the truth.

**38.** *two thieves.*] Or **robbers**. From this statement, compared with St. Mark's, it is evident that the two robbers were crucified after our Lord. St. Luke (v. 32) shews that they formed part of the dismal procession to Calvary. The choice of the malefactors was significant. They were robbers, that is brigands, not thieves. Pilate had given up one robber to the Jews; he takes this opportunity of crucifying two others, probably comrades of Barabbas (see Mark xv. 7), objects therefore of popular sympathy. Immense numbers (ἄπειρον τὸ πλῆθος) of such brigands, mostly religious fanatics, were crucified during the Jewish wars (Joseph. 'B. J.' xiii. 2, 3; see also Hausrath, 'Ztgsch.' i. 309.

**39.** *they that passed by.*] Calvary was selected as a conspicuous site, near the highway. The passers by, on the way to the Temple services, or returning full of the late events, would of course be numerous.

*reviled him.*] The rendering is substantially correct; but the word used by the first two evangelists is very strong: "they blasphemed Him." The words of reviling shew what charge had been urged most successfully by the chief priests (see note on verse 20), and the impression which had been made by our Lord's apparent helplessness; but they are words like those of Caiaphas (John xi.), of unconscious prophecy. For each expression here used, see the notes on Ps. xxii. 7, 8.

**41.** *the chief priests, &c.*] St. Matthew names thus the representatives of the Sanhedrim: the chief priests, its leaders; the scribes, the interpreters of the law; the elders (but see further on), the heads of families, who formed the majority of the council. It would seem to have been a formal act, as though they came to watch the execution of the sentence. Their presence implies that it was now between the services at 9 A.M. and mid-day. The interval between prayers was thus passed in contemplating the agonies of their victim, and in mockery, strangely worded so as to express the truth which they denied. For "elders," the reading of the oldest and best MSS, a large number have "Pharisees." Whether expressly here mentioned or not, the Pharisees formed a considerable part of the Sanhedrim, and, as zealots, were not likely to be absent. (See note above on verse 1.)

**42.** *He saved others.*] A mocking question, yet one which bore singular testimony to miracles of healing; doubtless also to the crowning miracle, which had brought matters to a crisis. (See John xi. 46-53.)

*himself he cannot save.*] That apparent want of power had shaken for a season the

Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him.

43 [d] He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God.

[d] Ps. 22. 8. Wisd. 2. 16, 17, 18.

44 The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth.

45 Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour.

46 And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say,

---

faith of the disciples, and changed the current of popular feeling; it now silences any lingering misgivings of members of the council, accustomed, in its best representatives, to judge by the event. (See Acts v. 35-39.)

*If he be the King of Israel.*] So the generality of MSS, ancient versions, and early Fathers. The two oldest MSS, supported by D, omit 'if,' and have *He is King of Israel*, a striking and probably correct reading: but the tendency to omission in ℵ and B must be borne in mind, and also the fact that although D agrees with them, neither the Coptic nor early Italic, which generally follow the same recension, support them in this passage.

**43.** *He trusted.*] The word expresses present, enduring trust. "**He trusteth in God.**" His enemies thus bear witness to that stedfastness of faith. The agent of the high priests, the pupil of the Scribes, the representative of the Pharisees, gives the answer to the challenge, "Declared to be the Son of God with power . . . . by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4).

**44.** *The thieves also.*] Or **robbers**. This statement shews that at first both joined in reviling; but see note on St. Luke.

**45.** *from the sixth hour.*] The darkness began, therefore, some time after our Lord's crucifixion, lasting from midday to 3 P.M.; and it extended over the whole land or earth. The darkness is undoubtedly represented as supernatural, not as connected with an eclipse, for it was now full moon. The early Fathers, however, were quite right in referring to the account given in a work on chronology by Phlegon of Tralles, a freedman of Adrian. He states that the greatest eclipse ever known occurred in the fourth year of the 202nd Olympiad, *i.e.* in the year from Midsummer A.D. 32 to A.D. 33; and that a great earthquake at the same time in Asia Minor overthrew the larger part of the city of Nicæa. The passage is quoted by Eusebius, 'Chron. ad Olymp.' 203, 1, and by Syncellus, p. 324 D, 325 A. See also Orig. c. Cels. ii. 6, 2. If, indeed, Phlegon were right in describing that darkness as a true eclipse, his statement would not bear upon this event; but it is certain that there was no natural eclipse in that year (see the tables in Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' p. 238). It is evident, therefore, that Phlegon speaks of a darkness equivalent to an eclipse, connected with a great earthquake, statements coinciding very strikingly with that of the evangelists. In the so-called Acts of Pilate it is said, that "lamps were lighted in the whole world." Of course what Pilate did report is utterly doubtful; but a notice of the great darkness was not likely to be omitted by him; it certainly did appear in the acts which Tertullian had before him. He says, "eum mundi casum relatum in arcanis vestris habetis." (Ap. xxi. p. 202, ed. Oehler.) Lucian, who suffered in the persecution under Decius at Nicomedia, appeals in like manner to official archives. (Sepp, vol. vi. p. 386.)

That darkness, depending on atmospheric or magnetic causes, often precedes or accompanies earthquakes, is a well-known fact. (Cf. Joel ii. 10; iii. 15, 16; Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8.) The birth and the death of the Saviour have thus analogous accompaniments; the star announcing life, the darkness prefiguring death, alike bear witness to the Lord of Nature.

Were any of the seven words spoken during those three hours? Words of grace to the blind agents and to the penitent sufferer had been previously uttered; but silence and darkness would seem to have prevailed during the last struggle with the principalities and powers of darkness.

**46.** *about the ninth hour.*] As the darkness passed away, immediately before death, the great cry was uttered. What was its meaning? We may not comprehend a mystery so deep; yet some points stand out clearly. In the first place, we observe that the words were a citation from the twenty-second Psalm, in which the Passion is depicted with a fulness and clearness equally evident to the Christian and to the freethinker. Nor can it be doubted that if the first words of the Psalm were thus present to the human consciousness of our Lord, the whole tenour of that great prophecy was also present. The cry, indeed, expressed our Lord's own personal feeling, but in a form which shewed complete self-possession, and in words which His own Spirit had spoken ages previously. Again, it is certain that the words would not have

e Ps. 22. 1. e My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

47 Some of them that stood there, when they heard *that*, said, This *man* calleth for Elias.

48 And straightway one of them ran, and took a spunge, f and filled *it* with vinegar, and put *it* on a reed, and gave him to drink.

f Ps. 69. 21.

49 The rest said, Let be, let us see whether Elias will come to save him.

50 ¶ Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost.

---

been ascribed to Him had they not been distinctly uttered; they would be irreconcileable with all that we read of our Lord's demeanour from the moment of His arrest, were they not explained by truths revealed afterwards to Christians. The "why," indeed, proposes a question not to be answered save by reference to the highest doctrines; to answer it the Christian has the words of Gethsemane and the teaching of the Spirit to guide him; the atonement depended on the complete fulfilment of the will of God by the Son accepting the only commensurate punishment for sin. We must further observe that in the Psalm, and in this utterance, the very word that speaks of abandonment declares the certainty of unbroken union, "MY God, MY God, **why didst THOU forsake me?**" When the *why* is answered, when the object is attained, the full blessedness of that eternal union will be restored, and communicated to all partakers in the benefits of the Passion. There was no despair, as Calvin assumes, no bewilderment, but a mighty anguish, mighty in proportion to the absolute dependence of Christ as man, and as Son, upon the Father. Bengel observes, with his usual deep insight, that the word "hast forsaken" (ἐγκατέλιπες) does not refer to the present, but to the past; "eo momento desiit derelictio;" "Why didst thou forsake me?" is therefore the better rendering; the words were spoken when the struggle, endured in silence, was completed. "In media et maxima derelictione silebat." No other word of complaint was wrung from Him; "super unâ derelictione queritur."

*Obs.* The words are Aramaic, not, however, quoted from the Targum, but translated directly from the Hebrew. (See note on Psalm xxii. 1.) The form of the words is most accurately represented by St. Mark, who learned it from St. Peter. St. Matthew, who writes "Eli, Eli," refers to the original Hebrew.

**47.** *for Elias.*] It is questioned whether this was spoken in mockery, or was a natural error. The Jews were constantly on the watch for the appearance of Elias, regarded by them as the great Patron Saint of the people, who conducted souls to Paradise, and who was to come and set all things right; hence the proverb, common in all cases of difficulty, "Wait till Elias comes!" The expression, however, does not necessarily imply that they took Eli, or Eloi, to be equivalent to Elias; a call upon God would by many be regarded as a request for the intervention of the prophet. It was, however understood, a bitter malignant irony: "What! he, the crucified, call upon our great Patron Saint!"

**48.** *ran, and took a spunge.*] The solitary word expressive of bodily suffering was then spoken, "I thirst" (see St. John); and one of the soldiers, who alone would be permitted to come close to the cross, or have access to the vessel in which the acid wine (called *posca*) used by them was kept, filled a sponge with it, and placed it upon a reed of hyssop. This indicates the height of the cross, a raising of the head beyond the reach of the outstretched hand, but not more than three or four feet, the greatest length of a hyssop reed. (See Tristram, N. H. B., p. 455.)

**49.** *Let be.*] The last word of bitter and cruel mockery. Those who spoke it shewed how far below the level of the heathen soldiery they had fallen in their fanaticism. A short time now intervened; it was towards the hour of even-service in the Temple, when the scene of the Passion would be of course deserted by the chief priests and the mass of the people; then those whom Jesus loved most dearly drew near enough to hear His last injunctions (St. John xix.); and then came the end.

**50.** *with a loud voice.*] Not with an inarticulate outcry, but with a word of deepest significance recorded by St. John, possibly equivalent to the last words of Psalm xxii. (where see note). The expression "yielded up the ghost," represents the force of the original; it indicates, though it does not necessarily assert, a voluntary surrender of life; that was attested by the words preserved by St. Luke. The loudness of the preceding cry, which some critics have compared to the shout of a hero dying in the crisis of a great victory, accords with this view. When all was accomplished, when the work of atonement was perfected, when the foundations of the kingdom of evil had been overthrown, then, and not till then, the Lord of Life yielded up His spirit to the Father. St. John has a word even clearer than St. Mat-

51 And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent;

52 And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose,

53 And came out of the graves

---

thew's, "He delivered up" (παρέδωκε), corresponding exactly to St. Luke's "I commend" (παρατίθεμαι).

Portents which followed the death of the Saviour, 51-56. The significance of these portents is admitted by all; they represent the complete triumph of the Son of God over the Temple, over the earth, over Hades, and over the spirit of man.

**51.** *the veil of the temple.*] The first and most deeply significant sign was the rending of the veil which hung before the Holy of Holies. At the hour of evening prayer on the day of Preparation, the hour and day of the Lord's death, it was the duty of the officiating priest to enter by a door within the thickness of the wall (six cubits deep according to the Talmud) which separated the Holy of Holies from the priests' court, into the space between the two immense curtains, each, according to Josephus, 40 cubits in height, 10 in breadth; he then opened the golden door of the Sanctuary, and rolled back the outer curtain. Then the priests and the people, who were in the outer court, looked up and saw the inner curtain rent from top to bottom, leaving the Holy of Holies open. The record suggests manifold thoughts to Christians: the entrance of the true High Priest into the eternal Sanctuary; the breaking down of all separation between man and God; the connection with our Lord's last word, "It is finished;" the rending of the veil of flesh in which He dwelt, was tabernacled (ἐσκήνωσε); the final breaking up of the ancient dispensation; these and similar explanations indicate, but do not exhaust, the full significance of the event. That it made a deep, though vague, impression on the Jews may be inferred from a notice in the Talmud, which records a bursting open of the great door of the Temple about this time (forty years before the fall of Jerusalem), compared with a legend in the gospel of the Hebrews, quoted by Jerome, 'Ep. ad Hedybiam' and 'ad Damasum,' that the threshold of the Temple was overthrown by a sudden shock. It must be observed, however, that the rending of the veil, though it took place simultaneously with the earthquake (see next note), could not have been caused by it. The veil was of great thickness, a palm or hand breadth, wrought of gold and purple, and proportionately strong. The sign was in the fullest sense preternatural: but, as Meyer observes (in answer to Strauss and Schleiermacher), there was no prophecy or popular belief which could have suggested it to the Evangelist, who relates it simply as a matter of fact, without dwelling on its significance.

*the earth did quake.*] Shocks of earthquake occur very frequently at Jerusalem. See Tobler, quoted by Dean Stanley; and compare the notices of the earthquake, the darkness, the crash and terror in Amos ii. 8; Zech. xiv. 4, 5; together with the descriptions of Josephus, 'Ant.' ix. 10, 4; and Stanley, 'Pal.' p. 185. This and the following clauses are peculiar to St. Matthew. The sympathy of nature, condoling, so to speak, with her Lord, is noted by ancient writers, Ps. Clem. 'Rec.' i. 41: "Denique cum pateretur omnis Ei compassus est mundus;" and by moderns, *e.g.* Neander, Olshausen, and Hase; but sympathy is not the right word; the earthquake bore witness to the might and majesty of the Son.

*the rocks rent.*] The word "the" points to rocks in the immediate neighbourhood, such as that in which Joseph of Arimathæa had lately hewn a sepulchre, and as Golgotha itself, in both of which traces of the earthquake are noticed by Cyril of Jerusalem. The splitting of rocks by earthquakes is so far from being an uncommon occurrence, that the ruins of Jerusalem are attributed in great part to this cause. (See Stanley, *l. c.*)

**52.** *the graves were opened.*] *I.e.* the rock-tombs, numerous in the environs of Jerusalem. The opening is a natural concomitant of earthquake. See the curious notice by Tobler, *l. c.*, "As a family were seated at their mid-day meal the dome-shaped roof suddenly opened, shewed the blue sky above, and again closed." It was a highly significant emblem of the breaking up of the realm of death.

*many bodies.*] This occurred after the resurrection of our Lord, "the first-born from the dead," Col. i. 18. "The saints" is used in the New Testament of Christians, but this use is confined to the Epistles. Early legends are busy with the names of the saints, specially the patriarchs and prophets who had announced or prefigured, and were awaiting His coming. Ignatius, 'Magn.' § 9, refers to this event, connecting it, as did most of the early fathers, with our Lord's descent into Hades, "being present, He raised them (the prophets) from the dead." (See also Westcott, 'Intr.' pp. 325-326.)

after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.

54 Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God.

55 And many women were there beholding afar off, which followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him:

56 Among which was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children.

57 [g] When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathæa, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple:

[g] Mark 15. 42. Luke 23. 50. John 19. 38.

58 He went to Pilate, and begged

---

**54.** *the centurion.*] St. Mark adds, "which stood over against them," and attributes the effect upon the centurion's mind wholly to His personal manifestation (see notes *in loc.*). St. Matthew refers the impression made on the minds of the centurion and soldiers to the whole series of events, the outer phenomena being especially calculated to affect their spirits. The more cultivated centurion was probably moved chiefly by all that he had seen of our Lord's demeanour, especially by his last words. The exclamation, "This was the Son of God," was apparently drawn forth by the word, "Father," twice repeated at the beginning and end of the crucifixion. (See St. Luke vv. 34, 46.)

**55.** *many women.*] Many besides those who are mentioned in the next verse. Their presence attests their stedfast faith and love: the point specially noted is that they had all followed Him, ministering to Him, from their distant home in Galilee.

*afar off.*] Very near approach was not permitted by the soldiers, but the ridge on which the holy women probably sate, was not so far distant as to prevent their hearing our Lord's words.

St. Luke states further that "all his acquaintance" were there, a fact not mentioned by St. Matthew or St. Mark. What struck them specially was that *women*, contrary to all usage, should be present.

**56.** *Among which.*] Three only are here mentioned. Mary Magdalene, who is specially named as the first witness of the Resurrection; Mary, the wife of Alphæus or Clopas (John xix. 25), mother of James the Less and Joses, called brothers of our Lord; and Salome, the wife of Zebedee. The presence of our Lord's mother, attested by St. John, is not recorded by the Synoptists. This might be because it seemed scarcely needful to name one, who could not be absent; or because in the formal and public account the Apostles would introduce no name which could possibly divert the thoughts of the reader from the one great form. When the mind of the Church was more fully formed, the last surviving Apostle named her, but even then incidentally, in reference to the new relationship, which thenceforth existed between himself and her. Theophylact, following Chrysostom, identifies Mary the mother of our Lord with the mother of James and Joses, not, however, as though they were her own children, but children of Joseph by a former wife. For Joses, Tischendorf, ed. 8, has Joseph. Johanna, the wife of Chuza, is mentioned by St. Luke, xxiv. 10, as present at the tomb.

57–66. THE BURIAL.

**57.** *the even.*] The even, or last quarter of the day, began at 3 P.M., and lasted till sunset, about 6 P.M., when the Sabbath commenced. (See note on Mark v. 42.)

*a rich man of Arimathæa.*] Either Ramah of Benjamin at a short distance from Jerusalem (but this is called Ramah by St. Matthew, ii. 18), or more probably Ramathaim of Ephraim (cf. 1 Sam. i. 1); LXX Armathaim. Many critics (Fritzsche, Meyer, Hilgenfeld), identify the two names, but Keim proves that they refer to different places. Both, however, belonged at that time to Judah, the latter from the time of Jonathan the Asmonæan (cf. 1 Macc. xii.). St. Luke therefore calls it a city of the Jews. The notices of Joseph's wealth and rank (cf. St. Mark and St. Luke) are important; only a rich man would possess a private tomb of his own construction, or find access to a man like Pilate, notorious for corruption (δωροδοκία, Philo, Leg. p. 1033). Both wealth and station may hitherto have been hindrances to the development of his spiritual life; but the tremendous shock, and the contemplation of our Lord's last acts and words, swept away all obstacles, and drew forth a "love stronger than death." He rendered the last service, one to which devout Hebrews attached great importance (see ch. viii. 21); but it was also the first on his part, and it is wrong to contrast his conduct with that of the disciples, who were present (see note on

the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered.

59 And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth,

60 And laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed.

61 And there was Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre.

62 ¶ Now the next day that fol-

---

v. 55), and of the holy women, who had long ministered unto their Lord and clung to Him to the last; they of course were not able to provide a sepulture, or to appproach the Roman with gifts. On the boldness of this act see note on St. Mark.

**58.** *to be delivered.*] This was usual on the application of relatives and near friends, otherwise the bodies were thrown into a common pit. In this and the preceding verse St. Matthew repeats the word "body" thrice, in which Meyer notes truly a touch of tender, painful sympathy on the part of the narrator.

**59.** *Joseph had taken the body.*] "Taken it *down*," as St. Mark says; so that Joseph, with the help of attendants—St. John names Nicodemus—lowered the body from the cross. The nails were probably removed by the soldiers, a formal process called the unnailing (ἀφηλοῦσθαι, Just. c. Tr. 108). The cross itself was usually taken down, and the body removed afterwards. (See Keim, iii. p. 516, note 1.)

*he wrapped it.*] Doubtless after the last usual rites, the ablution, the last kiss impressed on the lips by Mother and dearest friends. The head was then covered with the kerchief (*sudarium*, St. John), and the body wrapped in broad bands of finest linen. These rites may have been rendered hastily, and the last formal enfolding of the body in the bands with aromatic spices delayed until the Sabbath was past; but no long time would be required, the tomb being close at hand, within two hundred yards.

**60.** *in his own new tomb.*] That tomb, as we learn from St. John, and might infer from this account, was close by, in a garden or enclosure. It was hewn out of a rock, the low ridge immediately opposite to Golgotha. The original shape of the tomb and the way in which it was converted into its present form, are fully described by the late Professor Willis (see note on 33). In front of a tomb belonging to a rich family, there was generally a vestibule open to the air, then a low entrance sometimes, as in this case, on the side of a rock, leading into a square chamber of moderate dimensions, on one side of which was a place for the body, either cut some seven feet into the rock, or lengthways, three feet deep, with a low arch over it. These details are important, in their bearing upon the accounts of the first visits to the tomb after the Resurrection.

*a great stone.*] The tomb had been lately made, and the door which closed the entrance, the only aperture into the tomb, was a large stone, about six feet in breadth, three in height, which had not yet been fixed, but was lying near. Towards nightfall the holy body was thus left alone in its Sabbatic rest. Is it wrong to linger on the sacred spot? The angel said indeed afterwards, "He is not here: He is risen;" yet he added, "come, see the place where the Lord lay." The look of faith and love is permitted, nay invited.

**61.** Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joses, remained rapt in contemplation (ἐθεώρουν, St. Mark), until nightfall. Townson accounts, very convincingly, for differences in the accounts of St. Luke and the other evangelists. The great body of the holy women left in time to purchase the spices before nightfall. These two, probably with Salome, remained, and formed afterwards a separate group. It is probable that Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, resided at some distance from Calvary, on Mount Zion, near the Asmonean Palace; whereas the home of Salome and of either Mary might be, and probably was, in the northern quarter, where tradition places the house of Zebedee.

**62.** *the next day . . . . preparation.*] That is, on the Sabbath day. The expression is peculiar and striking. St. Matthew, as a Christian, lays more stress upon the day in its connection with the day of the Crucifixion, the Friday or its equivalent, the Preparation, than upon its sanctity as the great Hebrew festival; unless indeed he thereby intimates the special greatness of the Sabbath in the Easter week. Some critics suppose that the next day means the night after the Crucifixion, an improbable assumption, the usage of the Greek being pretty certain; but one, which, if adopted, would present a striking and ghastly scene: a visit late in the night would be in accordance with the former proceedings of the Hebrew leaders. It was a strange profanation of the Sabbath that on that day they should go to the Palace of the

lowed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate,

63 Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.

64 Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first.

65 Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make *it* as sure as ye can.

66 So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.

---

Roman Governor. They expected that *he* would give the order, and that his officers would see to its execution; but he threw the responsibility upon them.

*and Pharisees.*] Observe the active part which they still take in the proceedings on their own Sabbath day.

**63.** *we remember.*] They were therefore aware of the prophecy and understood its meaning, for they were guided by the sure instinct of hatred, in this case keener even than that of natural affection, which had in fact prevented the disciples from comprehending the intimations of their Master.

**64.** *by night.*] Omitted by all the best MSS and ancient versions.

**65.** *Ye have a watch.*] Rather "have a watch." Pilate puts at their disposal a band, probably a quaternion, of soldiers.

It has been argued that the chief priests might have taken possession of the body, or employed their own attendants in watching the tomb; but Pilate had given the body to a man of rank, and they would not have dared to interfere with its disposal, or take any such measures without his concurrence. Their precaution was not unnatural; from their point of view it was necessary. Vague notions of a resurrection were, as they knew, rife in the popular mind, and though as Sadducees they despised them, they might fear a ready acceptance of any rumour of its actual occurrence. They gave what they alone could give, an independent attestation; setting their seal to the stone they set their seal to the truth. It has again been argued that the presence of the guard would be known, and have prevented the visits to the tomb on the Sunday morning; but the disciples passed the Sabbath in utter solitude, doubtless with "doors shut for fear of the Jews" (St. John xx. 19), nor would any report reach them, whether the guard was set early in the morning, or, as seems more probable, later in the day.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 2, 9, 33, 34.

**2.** In order to determine the direction in which our Lord was led, we have to inquire where at that time was the temporary residence of Pontius Pilate. Formerly the general opinion was that when the Roman Procurator, whose habitual residence was at Cæsarea, visited Jerusalem, especially at the great festivals, he took up his quarters in the castle of Antonia, at the north-west of the temple enclosure. The permanent garrison had its quarters there; its tower commanded a view over every part of the Temple, and was connected with the northern portico by a flight of steps (see Acts xxi. 35), to which frequent reference is made by Josephus. Thus the procession would have a ready access to the governor, not incurring any risk of an outburst of popular feeling in favour of Jesus. The castle was of great extent, enlarged by Herod and fitted in all respects for the official abode of the governor. The general impression was strong enough to affect the sacred topography of Jerusalem, the Via Dolorosa leading from it westward to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Nor is this a medieval error; it is an old tradition, to which the Pilgrim of Bordeaux bears witness in the early part of the fourth century, A.D. 333. One objection to this site is that the castle is frequently mentioned as "the fortress" (φρούριον), or "the acropolis" (Joseph. 'Ant.' xv. 11, § 4), or "the castle" (more exactly 'encampments,' παρεμβολή), Acts xxi. 37; xxii. 24; but it is not called the Prætorium, that is, the Palace of the governor, as representative of the emperor. At present the prevalent view, adopted by Lewin as unquestionable, is, that the Prætorium was the magnificent palace which had been lately erected or rebuilt by Herod near the gate of Jaffa, on the north-west of Mount Zion. The road from the Temple to that castle would pass over the Tyropœum, in the direction of the so-called street of David. The chief reason for fixing on this site is, that some years later

this Palace was certainly occupied by Gessius Florus, as Procurator (see Joseph. 'B. J.' ii. 14, § 8), and that the proceedings under him resemble very closely those of Pilate at the trial of our Lord. Gessius Florus took his seat in the open air in front of the palace on the judgment-seat (*bema*), on a raised pavement, and in a place where vast numbers were assembled. It is further stated (by Hausrath, 'Zeitgeschichte,' i. 301, and by Schürer, 'Handbuch der Zeitg.' p. 250, but *without* specific authority) that the Romans took formal possession of this palace, and made it the official residence of the governor, when Judea was formally annexed to the province of Syria, A.D. 6. Nor can there be any doubt that it was occasionally occupied by Pilate; the old palace of the Asmoneans, between it and the Temple, being assigned as a residence to the descendant of Herod. These arguments are weighty, if not conclusive. The nearness of Herod's palace is a point of importance (see Luke xxiii. 7). It must also be admitted that this view suggests thoughts of exceeding interest. As our Lord's first trial had taken place in the palace of the high priest—His own representative—and the second trial in His Father's house, so the third and last was on the site of the castle of David, His great earthly ancestor, and in the presence of a multitude representing all classes of His own people.

9. (I.) It is evident that the passage here referred to is that noticed in the margin of the Authorised Version; *i. e.* Zechariah xi. 13. Why the name of Jeremiah should have been substituted for that of Zechariah is uncertain. The most obvious explanation is that which has been adopted without hesitation by many sound critics, both ancient and modern, viz., that it was simply an error, the name of the well-known Jeremiah naturally occurring to the writer's memory. It is not, however, probable that St. Matthew, who is specially conversant with the prophetic writings, should have made such a mistake; and if we admit it, we must refer it to one of the very earliest transcribers; in fact, to that transcriber who supplied the churches in all quarters with copies: but this is an assumption only less improbable than the former one; for such a mistake would have been easily discovered and corrected at that time. Another explanation, free from these difficulties, is that the name of Jeremiah stood in the beginning of the volume which was in the transcriber's hands, and that, when references were made to a collection of writings (as, for instance, to the books of Psalms and to the Proverbs), it was usual to quote the name given in the general inscription. Now, it is well known that the order of the prophetic books, as received in the Hebrew church in St. Matthew's time, ran thus: Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, the twelve minor prophets. Thus always in the Talmud, and at present in the MSS of the French and German Jews. To this it may be objected that St. Matthew would in that case have written "in the book of Jeremiah," not "by the prophet Jeremiah"—a plausible, but not conclusive, argument, since David and Solomon are frequently cited as authors of psalms and proverbs not actually written by them, and, in fact, ascribed to others in the inscriptions. In support of this it must be observed that Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel are the only prophets who are quoted by name by the Evangelists. It is not likely that St. Matthew, who omits the name of Micah in chapter ii. and that of Zechariah twice, in chapters xxi. 5, xxvi. 31, would have inserted the latter name here. It should also be remarked that, though Zechariah is repeatedly quoted or referred to (some 18 times) in the New Testament, he is not once named.

Other suggestions have little weight. It has been supposed that St. Matthew refers to a writing of Jeremiah not extant in our MSS, but preserved by oral tradition. Thus Origen, Euthymius Zygabenus, and some modern critics, as Kuinoel and Ewald. Eusebius suggested that it might have been expunged by the Jews; but such conjectures are utterly precarious. Dr. M'Clellan lays stress on the form of the quotation, τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ πρ., as though it refers to words spoken, but not written. This is a singular oversight in so careful and learned a writer, since τὸ ῥηθέν in the formula used regularly by St. Matthew in quoting written prophecies, *e. g.* i. 22; ii. 15, 17, 23; iii. 3, &c. &c. Meyer, again, supposes that the mistake might have been occasioned by a confused reminiscence of Jeremiah xviii. 2, a conjecture which, to use his own formula, "beruht auf sich." Bishop Wordsworth suggests that the name of one prophet is here substituted for another, to teach us not to regard the prophets as *authors* of their prophecies, but to trace them to divine inspiration—a sound principle in itself, but scarcely bearing upon the question before us.

(II.) Of more importance are the discrepancies between the text and the quotation. The words of St. Matthew differ both from the rendering of the Septuagint and from the Hebrew, of which he frequently gives an independent translation. The difference is so great as to make it certain, either that he did not write with the original text before him, or that his object was simply to note coincidences in leading points.

We will take the clauses separately.

In Zechariah xi. 12, the prophet, speaking as the representative and in the name of the Lord, says to the people, whom He had hitherto fed and protected, "If ye think

good, give me my price, and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver."

St. Matthew does not quote this, but he applies it very strikingly. The high priests, acting throughout as representatives of the people, estimate the price of their prophet and their Lord—the same ambiguity in both—at thirty pieces of silver.

Zechariah xi. 13. "And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prised at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord."

This verse St. Matthew condenses, bringing out only those points which directly concern him; but he makes some alterations also; "they took" for "I took," and "they gave" for "I gave." This was evidently for the sake of clearness: the first person would require a long explanation, and the only point which he had here to note was the use made of the money. A question is raised whether the word "potter" is a correct rendering of the Hebrew. Some adopt the rendering of the Targum, treasurer or treasury; but as Rosenmüller, on Zech. xi. 13, observes, it is scarcely credible that the prophet should have used so common a word as יוצר in a sense wholly unknown, nor had the money been put into the treasury, would the act have been contemptuous. The other ancient versions support this rational view. Aquila, who represents the Hebrew tradition, has *πρὸς τὸν πλάστην*. Jerome says, "in Hebræo legitur *joser*, id est *τὸν πλάστην*, quem nos fictorem et figulum possumus dicere." The LXX renders the word "smelting-place" (*χωνευτήριον*); substantially agreeing with the general interpretation, but substituting "the furnace" for "the smelter." See Köhler's conclusive note on the passage, 'Die nachexilischen Propheten,' Zech. p. 154. The general meaning appears to be that the price, a very contemptible amount, was to be handed over to the potter who made the earthen vessels for the service of the Temple; his residence, of course, was in the potteries, situate, as we have seen, at or near the place afterwards called Aceldama.

St. Matthew saw in this a figure or foreshadowing of what was done with the price at which our Lord was sold and bought. It was cast into the temple, but made over to the potter as the price for his clay-field.

The coincidences are, indeed, striking. The same price, the same persons whom the price concerned, those who paid it being the representatives of the people; He for whom it was paid the prophet, in a special sense the visible representation of Jehovah; the holy place into which it was cast; its destination, and its final use; these presented themselves to the mind of the Evangelist, taught by the Spirit to discern the significance of a transaction, originally most obscure, but finding a full explanation in that which he has to record.

**33.** We have to consider (1) the name, and (2) the site of Golgotha. The literal meaning given by St. Matthew is clear and uncontested—a place of a skull, equivalent to Calvary, or Calvaria, from calva, a bare skull; but it is questioned whether this refers to the shape of the place or to its use. Jerome, who is followed by Luther, and lately by Strauss and Fritzsche, explains it as *supplicii locus*, a place of execution, so named from the heads of malefactors; but to this there are grave objections. It is not probable that skulls or other bones would lie scattered about a place close to the city; nor has it ever been customary in the East to have places set apart for executions. It was usual to fix upon a site where the execution could be witnessed by multitudes, and a slight elevation near a high road and close to the city would best serve the purpose. The meaning, therefore, now generally adopted is "a place of a skull;" like a skull in form, a mound sloping on all sides, sufficiently high to be seen from some distance, not so high as to give unnecessary trouble in the erection of a cross. To the modern authorities cited by Meyer *in loc.* add Keim, p. 405. Farrar speaks doubtfully. Names taken from resemblance to parts of the body are common in all languages. (2.) The site is still considered doubtful by many, perhaps by the generality of modern critics; but the evidence in support of the traditional site is strong, and appears conclusive. It meets the essential conditions of nearness and conspicuousness. The only question is, whether it was outside of the second wall of the city. Robinson, who examined this question carefully, came to the conclusion that it was not, since the second wall must, as he argues, have included the pool of Hezekiah, and have, therefore, been at some distance to the west of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (vol. i. pp. 407-418). This argument is met by Furrer, in Schenkel's 'Bibel-lexicon,' *s. v.* Golgotha. He proves that the wall could not have run to the west of the pool: in that direction there are very few feet of rubbish, not immense masses, such as are found eastward of the church, and would have indicated the former existence of a great wall. The account of the advance of Titus, after taking the third wall, shews that he found no obstacle westward of the port of Hezekiah or Amygdalum (probably Ham-migdal, *i. e.* the Tower), close to which he erected a temporary fort. From other indications Furrer concludes that the second wall must have run from the west of the gate Gennath to Fort Antonia. These facts, which cannot be seriously affected by

future discoveries, confirm the very ancient, if not primitive, tradition. The Bordeaux pilgrim, A.D. 333, writes thus: "On the left side (of the original Church of the Holy Sepulchre) is the hillock (*monticulus*) Golgotha, where the Lord was crucified. Thence, about a stone-throw distance, is the crypt where His body was deposited." St. Cyril of Jerusalem alludes to the spot repeatedly. There was no doubt as to the site in the time of Eusebius. Professor Willis, in his exhaustive treatise on the Holy Sepulchre, shews the exact adaptation of the site, the actual height of the traditional mound in the chapel of Longinus, and other conditions, to the narrative of the evangelists: "The rock of Calvary still stands up fifteen feet above the pavement. It appears likely that, in its original state, this rock was part of a little swell of the ground that jutted out from the slope of Sepulchre Street, and probably always formed a somewhat abrupt brow on the west and south sides; for the south-west brow of the rock has just sufficient elevation to raise the wretched sufferers above the gazing crowd, that would naturally arrange itself below and upon the sloping side opposite, which formed a kind of natural theatre with respect to the brow of Calvary." (See Williams, 'Holy City,' ii. 240.) The full proof of the rediscovery of the true site is due to Professor Willis. The work, in which Furrer records his acquiescence, belongs to a school specially adverse to traditional views.

**34.** The first question is whether there is a real and substantial discrepancy between St. Matthew and St. Mark. St. Mark has *ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον*, "wine mingled with myrrh." St. Matthew, according to the Textus receptus, has *ὄξος μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον* (A. V., "vinegar mingled with gall). But for *ὄξος*, vinegar, the oldest MSS, even some which generally differ in disputed readings, have *οἶνον*. Thus ℵ B D K L Π and thirteen cursive MSS; so, too, the most important of the Ancient Versions, the old Italic, the Vulgate, Sahidic, Coptic, Syriac Pesh.[txt], Syriac[hr], Æthiopic, Armenian, the Anglo-Saxon, which follows the Vulgate and early Italian, and the Frank, *i.e.* the High-German of the ninth century. This reading is adopted by Ewald, Weiss, Bleek, Tischendorf, ed. 8, and M'Clellan. The other reading, as Tischendorf suggests, may have been introduced from the Septuagint, Ps. lxix. 21. If *ὄξος* were the true reading, it might refer to the *posca*, the diluted vinegar or sour wine commonly used by the soldiers. So far there is either an exact agreement, or a substantial coincidence in the two accounts.

The next question is, what the evangelists mean severally by the words gall and myrrh. Meyer says peremptorily, St. Matthew's "gall" must be literally "gall," the only meaning of *χολή*. This is contrary to the usage of the Septuagint, the real authority on this passage. There it corresponds twice to לַעֲנָה, wormwood, Prov. v. 4; Lam. iii. 15; and six times to רֹאשׁ, which certainly does not mean "gall," but a poisonous or strongly narcotic bitter; thus specially in Ps. lxix. 22. The word which St. Mark uses is derived from מֹר, *resina aromatica, odorata et amara*; but מֵיר (myrrh) and מְרֹרָה, which the LXX render *χολή* in Job xvi. 13, 16, come from the same root. The two evangelists had probably the same word before them in Aramaic. The Arabic version has the same word in St. Matthew and St. Mark. In that language it means "bitterness," and also specially "myrrh."

Here the agreement is substantial. Some common wine, such as the soldiers used, was mingled with a powerful narcotic drug, bitter, but offered as an anæsthetic: declined for that reason by the Lord of light and *life*.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

1 *Christ's resurrection is declared by an angel to the women.* 9 *He himself appeareth unto them.* 11 *The high priests give the soldiers money to say that he was stolen out of his sepulchre.* 16 *Christ appeareth to his disciples,* 19 *and sendeth them to baptize and teach all nations.*

IN the [a]end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first

[a] Mark 16. 1. John 20. 1.

CHAP. XXVIII.—1–10. APPEARANCES TO THE HOLY WOMEN.

**1.** *In the end of the sabbath . . . . week.*] It was at the early dawn before sunrise on Sunday morning, that these holy women set out from their home, in order to visit the sepulchre; but the meaning of the expression rendered "in the end of the Sabbath" is questioned. It cannot mean before the end of the Sabbath, for that day closed at sunset, so far as the law of ceremonial observance was concerned. Meyer says, as usual positively, it must mean late in the Sabbath, which is simply impossible, taking the word in its legal sense. The rendering after the Sabbath, or at a late hour after the Sabbath, is fully justified by quotations from Hellenistic writers (ap. Wetstein), and is adopted by Fritzsche, Ewald, and De Wette. The holy women left their home at the first dawn of day, nearly twelve hours after the close of the Sabbath.

*day* of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.

2 And, behold, there [1]was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.

[1] Or, *had been.*

3 His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow:

4 And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead *men*.

5 And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified.

---

*the first day of the week.*] St. Matthew uses the Hebrew idiom, literally "day one of the week," but he takes the day in the natural, not in the Jewish sense, as beginning with sunrise. The first day was regarded by the Hebrews as specially holy. In addition to passages quoted by Lightfoot, the following is given by Schoettgen: "that day has ten crowns. It is first in the work of creation, first for the princes of the people (who met on that day to consecrate the Temple), the first for the priesthood, first in the Levitical service, the first on which fire from heaven consumed the sacrifice, the first on which the Shechinah descended (on the Tabernacle), the first in which Israel received the benediction, and the first in the order of months." To which the Christian adds: the first in the new creation, the first in which the access to heaven was effected, the first in the dispensation of life.

*came.*] Townson lays considerable stress on the twofold meaning of this word, "went" (as in John xxi. 3) being equally correct. It thus points to the hour at which they left home, which would naturally be the first glimmering of light, about twenty minutes before sunrise, so that they would reach the sepulchre when the sun was already above the horizon. (See note on Mark xvi. 1, 2.) St. Matthew mentions Mary Magdalene and Mary (the mother of James) apart, in reference to his previous notice (ch. xxvii. 61). They were accompanied by Salome, and they had purchased spices the previous evening, after the close of the Sabbath. (See St. Mark.) The notices in St. Luke are held by Townson and other able critics to refer to the other holy women who were with Joanna, the wife of Chuza. See Townson's Works, edited by Churton, vol. ii. p. 121 f. Michelhaus, in a work just published, 'Akad.-Vorl.' ed. Zahn, takes the same view, vol. i. p. 434.

**2.** *there was a great earthquake.*] A repetition of the shock described in ch. xxvii. 51; as such not unusual after an interval, but in this case distinctly stated to be supernatural as to its cause. Meyer is wrong in asserting that the events here recorded took place after the arrival of the women. St. Matthew uses the aorist, which simply denotes the fact, not the time of its occurrence. Here, apart from all reference to the other evangelists, it is evident that St. Matthew describes what took place while they were on the way from home, thus accounting for what they saw on their arrival: the stone rolled away from the entrance of the tomb, within the vestibule the guards lying prostrate, and as they entered the vestibule, hastening to the chamber of death, the angel sitting on the stone. For the form of the tomb and of the stone which had closed it, see note on ch. xxvii. 60.

*sat upon it.*] Or, "was seated upon it." The word describes the angel as already occupying that position when the holy women arrived.

**3.** *His countenance.*] Literally, his appearance or form; but the Authorised Version is substantially correct. The flashing light of his countenance is meant.

**4.** *did shake*, or "quake."] The word indicates a severe convulsion, as in an earthquake.

**5.** *And the angel answered.*] This expression probably indicates a gap in the narrative. The holy women, on their arrival, saw at once that the entrance of the tomb was open, and on entering the vestibule, found the angel sitting on the great stone which had been rolled back. They started back in terror, not convulsed like the soldiers on guard then lying prostrate before the angel, but they were at once consoled by his words, "Fear not ye;" *you* have no cause for fear, for I know the piety and love which brought you hither.

**6.** *for he is risen.*] This certainly implies that the resurrection had taken place before the arrival of the holy women—probably also before the descent of the angel. There was, therefore, no connection between our Lord's quitting the tomb and the removal of the stone, which was done in order to enable the loving followers of Christ to enter. The accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark so far coincide. Both omit to notice the previous departure of Mary Magdalene, who, on seeing the tomb open, had gone at once to inform the disciples. The narrative of St. Luke refers, as Townson has shewn, to a second group accompanying Joanna somewhat later to the tomb.

*Come, see the place.*] Hence it follows that the

6 He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay.

7 And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you.

8 And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word.

9 ¶ And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him.

---

other Mary and Salome, under the guidance of the angel, passed through the narrow entrance, and saw within the tomb the empty place where the body had been laid by Joseph, doubtless in their presence. There they received further directions. St. Matthew, with his usual brevity, omits here to say that they did enter the tomb (but see v. 8), and to tell us what they saw within it; but there is no reason to suppose that the two angels, afterwards seen by Mary Magdalene, were then visible.

7. *go quickly, and tell his disciples.*] The disciples were, therefore, in Jerusalem—certainly not at Bethany, as Dr. M'Clellan supposes. They were also together, probably in the upper chamber, where we find them on several occasions immediately afterwards. The distance cannot have been considerable, since Mary Magdalene fetched Peter and John, and accompanied them in their rapid visit to the open tomb.

*he goeth before you into Galilee.*] This was a command to the twelve, and to all who had followed our Lord from Galilee. There, where His public ministry began, the Apostles were to receive their commission. St. Luke omits this direction, since he was writing for Gentiles. little conversant with local circumstances, and was recording a different appearance of angels.

*lo, I have told you.*] In accordance with our Lord's word (ch. xxvi. 32; Mark xiv. 28), to which the angel refers, as we learn from St. Mark.

8. *And they departed,* or "went out" of the sepulchre. Thus St. Matthew shews incidentally that they had entered it.

*with fear and great joy.*] St. Mark dwells chiefly on the fear, as a feeling less to be expected than the extreme joy, which St. Matthew not less naturally mentions. The holy women thus ran in order to bear the message to the assembled disciples, but, as St. Mark notices, they spoke to no one on the way. It may be inferred, from comparing the accounts of the evangelists that they were anticipated by Mary Magdalene, and found the disciples informed of what had transpired, though as yet not convinced.

9. *as they went to tell his disciples.*] These words are omitted by those of the oldest MSS, and are not necessary to complete the sense: but they rest on good authority, and the omission is more easily explained, than their insertion. The narrative presents some difficulty. It may be an instance of St. Matthew's habit of grouping events which the other evangelists detail separately. We know from St. Mark and St. John that the first personal appearance of our Lord was to Mary Magdalene, and from St. Luke that the message brought to the disciples was disbelieved. There is, therefore, reason to assume that in this verse St. Matthew, who gives a succinct and complete summary of all appearances to the women, refers to the separate manifestation to Mary Magdalene. There can be no doubt as to the fact that all the evangelists, St. Matthew most frequently, do thus sometimes combine distinct events, "tracing with bold outline the great features of the history." (Westcott, Int. p. 332.) One of the plainest and most striking instances of such combination will be found in Acts xxvi. 15-18. St. Matthew passes over all other appearances of our Lord in Jerusalem, a far more important omission, hastening onwards to the great declaration with which this Gospel closes.

It is, indeed, possible that St. Matthew refers to an appearance not recorded by the other evangelists; but in that case many circumstances must be assumed. Thus Lange (vol. iii. p. 362) holds that the two companies of women joined Mary Magdalene, and comparing what each had seen, resolved to go at once and announce to the disciples the appearance and message of the angel. Then, as they were on the way, Jesus met them and saluted them. This appears to be somewhat strained; but it bears upon a principle which throughout such inquiries should be kept in mind. Independent accounts of events occurring in a time of exceeding excitement, and related by truthful witnesses, but from different points of view, naturally present difficulties which cannot be cleared up without a thorough knowledge of all particulars; and such attempts as those of Lange, M'Clellan, and, above all, of Townson, prove at least that events might have occurred in such order and form, as, if known, would satisfactorily explain all divergences.

*All hail.*] The usual form of salutation,

10 Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me.

11 ¶ Now when they were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done.

12 And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers,

13 Saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him *away* while we slept.

14 And if this come to the go-

---

but here to be taken in its literal significance, "rejoice." The first word of greeting awakened the feeling of great joy. Hence the absence of terror in the responsive act of the holy women.

Three acts denote their feelings: they came to Him (not simply came); they took hold of His feet, an act of deep humility and fervent love, permitted for the first and, it would seem, for the last time by our Lord (see St. John xx. 17); they worshipped Him, the first (*not* the only, see v. 17) instance of adoration recorded before the Ascension, here offered not by Apostles, but loving women.

**10.** *Be not afraid.*] The blending of fear with love has been noticed by St. Matthew (v. 8); but the word of our Lord may seem rather to refer to St. Mark's brief and striking account (xvi. 9).

*my brethren.*] The first time that this word is applied to the disciples by our Lord. Ancient interpreters saw in it a designation of great honour. Some moderns (*e.g.* Meyer) far less reasonably find in it a reproof of the act of adoration, to which it certainly does not refer. Had the act been superstitious, it would have been directly reproved. The true and natural explanation is that on the first appearance of the risen Saviour He gave His loved ones an assurance of the continuance and deepening of His feelings of affection towards them. Indeed, this expression has a peculiar, if not exclusive propriety after the resurrection, when He became "the first-born from the dead."

*Galilee.*] The repetition of the injunction confirms St. Mark's account, that up to this time the holy women had spoken to no one, or that, as St. Luke says, their account of the angel's appearance had not been believed.

11-15. Report of the Watch.

**11.** *when they were going.*] While the women were still on the way, some of the soldiers of the watch went straight to the chief priests, at whose disposal they had been placed by Pilate. This was the only course open to them. What they would report would, of course, be that, after a shock of earthquake, such as was common especially after a previous shock (see note above), they had seen a vision of dazzling brightness, and that the stone was rolled away. The chief priests might take the account of the earthquake and the displaced stone as facts, and feel that, after a night's watching close to Golgotha, the soldiers' minds would be in a state in which lightning might be taken for an angel. But they were well aware that their own disbelief was not shared by the people; and though sure that, if the soldiers gave in such a report to their own commander, they would be executed at once, they were equally certain that the statement would be generally accepted as proving a supernatural interference. The soldiers were completely in their power. Let them confess that they had slept, and that while they slept the Body had been taken away, all would be safe. But the question is raised whether they could shield the soldiers from punishment. To this the answer is obvious. The soldiers had but to report that the chief Priests, whose work they had to do, were satisfied, and Pilate would certainly not concern himself further with the matter, or, accepting the Jews' own statement, that they had no complaint to make, would sneer at the frustration of their precautions.

**12.** The consultation with other members of the Sanhedrim was called for. All knew the precautions which had been taken, and were alike interested in the question, what was now to be done? This was probably a formal meeting, though the few members who believed in, or were favourably disposed to our Lord would naturally be absent, a point which ought to have occurred to such critics as Meyer and Reuss.

*they gave large money.*] No money would have induced the soldiers to give in such a report to their own officers; but if they knew that none would be called for under the circumstances (see note on v. 11), they might be induced by a large bribe to make the declaration to the council, or unofficially to Jews who might make inquiry. They knew well that the high priest did not believe that they had slept on their watch. In that case they would have been given up at once to the legal and inevitable punishment.

**14.** *we will persuade him.*] In plain words, "bribe him." Meyer denies this; but the

vernor's ears, we will persuade him, and secure you.

15 So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day.

16 ¶ Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them.

17 And when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted.

---

passages quoted by Wetstein (*in loc.*) prove the common usage. Pilate's accessibility to bribery was well known.

*secure you.*] The word is to be taken in its literal and full sense—save you from anxiety and danger.

**15.** *and this saying . . . . until this day.*] This Gospel in its present form was written after an interval of, at least, some thirty years, during which no other account of the disappearance of our Lord's body was given by the Jewish rulers. One point is thus conclusively proved; the body could not be found. The chief priests would, of course, at once ascertain the fact whether it was still in the tomb; nor, when they heard that it was gone, would they spare any pains to discover it. Had it been in the possession of the disciples, it would have been an effectual barrier to belief in the Resurrection, nor could they have concealed it from the agents of the rulers. That the story in the form here given was widely disseminated, not only up to the time, but long after the publication of this Gospel, is proved by the express statement of Justin Martyr in controversy with the Jew Tryphon (ch. cviii. p. 335), "Ye appointed chosen men, and sent them to all the world to preach thus: 'A godless and lawless heresy has been raised by a certain Galilean impostor, and when we had crucified him, his disciples stole him by night from the tomb.'" Now, Justin Martyr either alludes to this passage, thus attesting its authenticity, or he states a fact within his own experience, attesting its truth. It is certain he would not have made the statement had not the fact been notorious. At a later period the blasphemous legend, called the 'Toledoth Jesu,' repeats the story, with additions specially invented to account for the concealment of the body. (See 'Die Jesusmythen des Judentums,' by Rösch, in the 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1873.)

*among the Jews.*] St. Matthew uses this expression here for the first time, in St. John's gospel the usage is uniform.

16-20. THE APPEARANCE IN GALILEE.

**16.** *Then the eleven.*] Or, "**but** the eleven." St. Matthew gives no note of time. In fact, more than eight days elapsed before they left Jerusalem, after the conversion of the solitary doubter. (St. John xx.)

*into a mountain.*] "**The mountain.**" This indicates an omission, such as occurs often in this Gospel, there being no previous notice of a direction given to the disciples. It must have been given at a meeting in Jerusalem, so that the statement confirms the testimony of the other evangelists. It is not improbable that the mountain, on which our Lord delivered the great discourse at the beginning of His public ministry, was the place appointed for the last solemn charge in Galilee; but He "appointed" (ἐτάξατο) naturally points to a special direction for this occasion.

It is doubtful whether this meeting took place immediately after the arrival of the disciples in Galilee. Such is the first impression made by St. Matthew's account, and it seems natural that they should at once proceed to the place which He had appointed. On the other hand, many of the disciples went, as we know from St. John, to their own homes, and even for a short time returned to their early occupations. Some time might be allowed for summoning all the followers of our Lord. It also seems probable that the restoration of St. Peter preceded the delivery of the great charge. Still, at the most, a few days only can have elapsed. The following charge was, therefore, not the last, but the first, solemn charge given to the whole body of believers. It must, therefore, have been many days before His Ascension.

**17.** *And when they saw him.*] All had not seen Him previously, few, if any, having been present when He appeared to the eleven in Jerusalem. This was the first meeting with the assembled disciples, of whom upwards of five hundred were now present, as we read in the earliest written account of appearances after the Resurrection. (See 1 Cor. xv. 6, which most probably speaks of this transaction.) Meyer, in his note on that passage, agrees with Ewald, that St. Paul speaks of a meeting in Galilee.

*they worshipped him.*] Thus following, and sanctioning by a public act, the example of the holy women on the morning of the Resurrection (see v. 9). Before the Passion worship had been offered to our Lord by others; rarely, if ever, by His own Apostles. (Bengel.)

*but some doubted.*] Apparently, while He was at a distance; and certainly not whether He was risen, but whether he was

18 And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

19 ¶ [a]Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

20 Teaching them to observe all

[a] Mark 16. 15.

---

there present. Recognition in all cases of appearance between the Resurrection and Ascension, depended upon the spiritual state of the witnesses, or upon His will. The doubt did not imply unbelief, for our Lord does not reproach them, as in other cases, but came near and spoke to them.

**18.** *All power is given.*] Literally "all authority was given," *i.e.* the fulness of power to govern the universe was imparted to Christ at His resurrection; not as a new gift, but a confirmation and practical realisation of the power over all things, which had been delivered unto Him by the Father (see ch. xi. 27), and had been received by Him in His human nature at the time of the Incarnation. It was a restoration to the glory which was His, as Son of God, from eternity; but the special point to which He now directs His disciples' minds is that they serve One who has entered into full possession of unlimited dominion.

*in heaven.*] Over all principalities and powers of the spiritual world. Angels were to be henceforth "ministering spirits" "to the heirs of salvation." The true sphere of the Church, as a spiritual body, is "in heavenly places" (cf. Eph. i. 3, 20-22; Phil. ii. 9, 16), and there all things are subject to its Lord.

*and in earth.*] Or "on the earth;" the sphere of the Church, as a visible body, where it would have to struggle, and, by virtue of this charter, to prevail until the end.

**19.** *Go ye therefore.*] The word "therefore," omitted in the oldest MSS, and in late critical editions (see note in Tisch. ed. 8), was doubtless inserted in order to mark the connection of thought. The universal power assures the success of the universal mission. If retained, it should therefore be printed in italics.

*teach all nations.*] Literally "make disciples of all nations," *i.e.* bring all nations into the body of disciples. This includes the processes of conversion, and of incorporation into the Church. The word "teach" ought not to have been used here, being applied in its true sense in the next verse; but our Translators probably chose it as a single word coming near to the original. "Christianise" might express the meaning more nearly, but we have not an exact equivalent. The catholicity of the Church stands thus at the head of its charter. That was the first and most striking distinction between it and Judaism. All nations are to become members of a body, in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile, all being one in Christ.

*baptizing them.*] The conditions and processes by which discipleship is effected are, first, the initiatory sacrament, then, complete instruction. Make them disciples by baptizing and by teaching them.

*in the name.*] Rather "into the name." The difference is considerable. "In the name" might imply that baptism was to be administered by church ministers acting in the name of the Almighty. "Into the name" means that converts are pledged by baptism to a faith, which has for its object the Being designated by that name, and which brings them into union with Him. The word "name" has a wide and deep meaning; it implies a living reality, a power, and in Scripture, when applied to God, is equivalent to the Godhead.

*of the Father . . . Holy Ghost.*] The twofold truth in the doctrine of the Trinity is thus distinctly stated. (1.) Identity in Essence. The Three have one Name; no Being, however glorious, not being God, could be included in one Name. The Son and the Holy Ghost are objects of the Faith thus set forth, not less distinctly than the Father. (2.) The order is equally clear; first, He from Whom all proceeded; second, He through Whom all proceedeth; third, He by Whom all proceedeth. Co-ordination as to essence and name, subordination as to mutual relation and office.

The first act of admission into the Church thus involves recognition of the fundamental principle of all dogmatic truth. In the case of adults, the recognition would of course precede baptism; in the case of infants, it would follow. Such was the faith in which they were to be trained, being admitted into the body on the responsibility of their parents or sponsors.

**20.** *Teaching them to observe.*] Practical teaching, including every principle of moral and spiritual duty, is thus inseparably connected with doctrinal teaching. The doctrine is simple, complete, absolute, summed up in a short form, henceforward the true baptismal formula, and the foundation of the creed of the Church. The practical teaching is to be founded wholly on Christ's command. Hence the first duty of the Church was to present those words in a complete

things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world. Amen.

---

and authoritative form. This was the main object contemplated by St. Matthew, who at a very early period wrote in Hebrew the Gospel which was entitled "the oracles of the Lord," not as excluding a record of His acts, but as giving special prominence to His discourses. The next great, indeed the permanent duty of the Church, is to inculcate those duties by oral teaching, by means of a ministry duly authorised to carry on the work of the Apostles.

*I am with you alway.*] Literally **all the days.** This implies continuous presence and support. There was to be no period of suspended life; no day in which the Saviour would forsake His Church. A long period is thus intimated for the interval which was to elapse. "All the days" would scarcely be used of a brief period, such as modern interpreters are too apt to assume to have been looked for by Apostles taught by their Lord. And "with you," as Bishop Wordsworth points out, here implies intimate relation, abiding support. It refers specially to the great name Immanuel.

*the end of the world.*] The expression means the completion of the æon, or age, during which the Church has to accomplish its work of preparation.

With this sublime utterance St. Matthew winds up his Gospel, throughout which he has kept the principles, which are thus enunciated, distinctly before our minds; the universal sovereignty of Christ; His purpose of bringing all nations into His kingdom; the conditions of admission and continuance in His Church; the complete records of His teaching, doctrinal, moral, and spiritual; and the assurance of perpetuity and progress under His abiding presence.

# THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

# ST. MARK.

## CHAPTER I.

1 *The office of John the Baptist.* 9 *Jesus is baptized,* 12 *tempted,* 14 *he preacheth:* 16 *calleth Peter, Andrew, James and John:* 23 *healeth one that had a devil,* 29 *Peter's mother in law,* 32 *many diseased persons,* 41 *and cleanseth the leper.*

THE beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God;

CHAP. I. The Gospel of St. Mark begins with the public announcement of the coming of Jesus Christ, and in the form presented to us by nearly all manuscripts (see notes on ch. xvi.) it ends with an account of His ascension. This is in exact accordance with the limits defined by St. Peter (Acts i. 22), when he describes the conditions of the first apostleship, "beginning with the baptism of John, until the day that He was taken up from us." Thus, too, as Professor Westcott observes (see 'Introd. to the Study of the Gospels,' p. 171), "St. Peter before Cornelius, and St. Paul in the synagogue of Antioch sketch shortly the significant events of the Saviour's life within the very limits which were marked from the first—the Baptism of John and the Ascension." See also the statement of Irenæus, quoted in the note at the end of ch. xvi. This first section is exclusively concerned with that beginning, which is marked also distinctly by our Lord's words (Luke xvi. 16), "the law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached." The subject-matter of the Baptist's preaching forms an integral part of what St. Mark calls "the beginning of the Gospel;" his special object being to announce the advent of the One mightier than himself.

### 2-8. THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

1. *The beginning of the gospel.*] The word "Gospel" is here used in the primary sense of glad tidings; not, as in some passages, the subject-matter of revelation, but the announcement of the Saviour's coming. (Εὐαγγέλιον, active, not passive; the declaring, not the things declared; so Cremer, Weiss, Köstlin, and other critics. The article before "beginning" is not in the Greek, and is omitted by Davidson; but it is required by the English idiom.

*of Jesus Christ.*] "Jesus Christ" is an expression not found elsewhere in the synoptical Gospels, not even in St. Luke, who uses it frequently in the Acts. It stands here with great propriety, since St. Mark is stating the whole subject-matter of the announcement—Jesus in His humanity, Christ in His office, Son of God in His eternal nature. Cf. Holtzmann 'Die Synoptischen Evangelien,' p. 276; and Reuss, 'Die Heiligen Schriften N. Test.,' p. 173, 5th edition.

*the Son of God.*] Or, omitting the article, "Son of God." (On the reading, see note at the end of the chapter.) The expression is common to all the Evangelists, but it has a special significance in this passage. St. Matthew's first object is to shew that Jesus is the Christ, the fulfiller of prophecy as King of Israel, and as such King of all nations of the earth—points which come out distinctly in the first words of his Gospel, and most fully in its close. Hence he calls Him "the Son of David," words which, on the contrary, St. Mark never uses in his narrative—rarely even when quoting the words of others, *e.g.* ch. x. 47, 48; xii. 35. St. John, writing, like St. Mark, chiefly for converts from heathenism, like him also uses the form Son of God constantly (twenty-nine times), and especially on occasions when full belief is demanded or declared. St. Mark, who has it seven times, contemplates our Lord more specially as the possessor of inherent Divine power, mighty in word and specially in deed; as Pressensé, 'Histoire de Jésus,' p. 209, says, "C'est l'Évangile de la force divine en Jésus-Christ." The term, moreover, is peculiarly important, as at once presenting our Saviour in His relation to the universe; hence the force of the words in ch. xvi. 15, "to every creature" (πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει).

2 As it is written in the prophets, [a] Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

3 [b] The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

4 [c] John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance [1] for the remission of sins.

5 [d] And there went out unto him all the land of Judæa, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.

6 And John was [e] clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of a skin about his loins; and he did eat locusts and wild honey;

7 And preached, saying, There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am

[a] Mal. 3. 1.
[b] Isai. 40. 3. Luke 3. 4. John 1. 23.
[c] Matt. 3. 1.
[1] Or, *unto*.
[d] Matt. 3. 5.
[e] Matt. 3. 4.

---

2. *As it is written in the prophets.*] (On the reading see note at the end of chapter.) St. Mark is singularly sparing in references to the prophets; here, however, at the outset he lays down the broad principle, that whatever did occur in connection with the Son of God, had been divinely predicted. Thus Irenæus, *l. c.*, 'he begins with the prophets.' St. Peter doubtless made exposition of prophecy a main point in addressing Hebrews (see all his discourses in the Acts, and notices in his Epistles, *e.g.*, 1, i. 10-12; ii. 6-10; 2, i. 19-21; iii. 2), and in instructing converts after their admission into the Church; but in the first broad sketch of the history of Christ he may have been satisfied with a general allusion to the "witness" of "all the prophets." (Cf. Acts x. 43.)

*my messenger.*] Or, "My angel." (See notes on Mal. iii. 1, and St. Matt. xi. 10.)

*before thy face.* Malachi has "my face." St. Mark agrees with St. Matthew, *l. c.*, where see note, and St. Luke. The change of persons has a special significance, identifying the Son in essence with the Father, and distinguishing Him in personality.

3. *The voice.*] Or, **a voice.** The two prophecies, as understood by the Evangelists, concur in representing the coming of Jesus Christ as the coming of Jehovah. For "the Lord," Isaiah has "Jehovah;" and for "His," he has "our God." Our Saviour is thus called "Jehovah," and "our God."

4. *John did baptize.*] This clause is closely connected with the first verse. The beginning of the Gospel-tidings was John, who came baptizing in the wilderness, and proclaiming a baptism of repentance preparatory to remission of sins. (See note below.)

*in the wilderness.*] See note on St. Matt. iii. 2, and Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' p. 175. St. Luke explains the word correctly: "John came into all the country about Jordan"—*i.e.*, into the district on the west of the Jordan, called the Ghor, or Aulon.

*baptism of repentance.*] A baptism requiring and representing an inward spiritual change. (See note on Matt. xxvii.)

*for the remission of sins.*] It is questioned whether this means that forgiveness was an immediate result of John's baptism (so Hoffmann, Ewald) or promised as a gift to be bestowed afterwards (Meyer, Alford, Bishop Wordsworth). If the repentance were sincere, the baptism must have been a pledge of remission of sins. Lustration was always deemed so far effectual, the inner condition being fulfilled: it took away the guilt (*reatus*) of the old life, though it could not, like Christ's baptism, communicate a new life. Those who came to John the Baptist were fleeing from the wrath to come. Weiss (p. 42) says, that in no other passage is there any intimation that John connected his baptism with forgiveness of sin; but the connection is implied by the Evangelists (cf. Matt. iii. 6, 11, 14; Luke i. 16, 17), and expressly declared by St. Luke, ch. iii. 3.

5. *they of Jerusalem.*] Late editors adopt "all they of Jerusalem;" to which strong, if not conclusive objections are urged by Fritzsche. It is one thing to say that all Judea went, another that every man in Jerusalem went. Several MSS and versions of high authority have the word "all" after "baptized," a reading adopted by the A. V., which commends itself as internally probable.

*the river of Jordan.*] St. Mark alone inserts the word "river;" his first readers would know little of the geography of Palestine. Some MSS, however, have the word in Matt. iii. 6.

6. See notes on St. Matthew. The full description of St. John Baptist has a special suitableness in this passage; calling attention to his resemblance to the Tishbite Elijah, "the messenger" of Malachi. (See *v.* 2.)

7. *And preached.*] Rather "and **he** preached." In *v.* 5 the expression "did baptize" was explained; here the Evangelist reverts to the other specific point, "he was preaching;" the subject-matter of preaching or proclamation being the coming of Him who was to give spiritual baptism.

*There cometh one mightier than I after me.*] Or, "There cometh **He who is mightier**"

not worthy to stoop down and unloose.

8 I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.

f Matt. 3. 13.

9 f And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.

10 And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens [1]opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him:

[1] Or, *cloven*, or *rent*.

11 And there came a voice from heaven, *saying*, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

12 g And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness.

g Matt. 4. 1.

---

(lit. "the mightier") "than I after me." St. Mark differs slightly from the other Synoptists, using a more definite expression than St. Matthew. "After me" is omitted by St. Luke, but strongly corroborated by St. John, ch. 1, 27, 30. The contrast between the order of time and that of rank is important, as is also the reference to the preparatory office of the Baptist, "the mightier One" being the Person designated in both prophecies as the object of his preaching.

*the latchet of whose shoes.*] This was the duty of a slave in personal attendance on his master. The word "to stoop down," added by St. Mark, vividly represents the act of the slave humbly and dutifully bowing down at his master's feet. The act was, however, adopted as a simple expression of extreme reverence. See Martyr. Polycarp. ch. xiii. The word "unloose" (Luke iii. 16; John i. 27), or "bear," would seem to refer to the conclusion of the Master's work: the ministry of John was concerned with its beginning only; he went before the Strong One to announce His coming, but was not in attendance upon Him when He came: it was for others to do the greater work, carrying on their ministration after the completion of His course.

**8.** *I indeed have baptized.*] Or "I indeed baptized you."

*but he.* The word "He" is emphatic.

*with the Holy Ghost.*] Or, "in the Holy Ghost;" lit., "in Holy Spirit." The Holy Spirit is here represented as a life-giving stream; rather in His operation than in His Personality. "In" expresses the immersion of the converts' entire being in the spiritual influence. The distinction is marked distinctly in the original; "water," as in St. Luke's Gospel is, noted as instrumental only (ὕδατι, but here ἐν Πν. 'Α.).

This verse completes "the beginning of the Gospel;" the three following verses describe the initiatory act of fulfilment.

### 9-11. The Baptism of Jesus.

On the question why our Lord was baptized, see note on St. Matt. iii. 15; here we have to notice the connection of this act with the special statement of St. Mark. The culminating point of John Baptist's proclamation was that the Mightier One should baptize with the Holy Ghost: here we read that the Holy Ghost descended on Jesus at His baptism; a descent which would seem to have invested the human nature with the power of baptizing others: it corresponded thus with the illapse of the Spirit at Pentecost, conveying the fulness of spiritual powers —an act distinct from the process of personal sanctification. This distinction, which is clearly marked in Holy Scripture, was overlooked by the earliest heretics, Cerinthus and the Docetæ, who represented this event as the coming of the eternal Christ for personal indwelling (see Irenæus i. xxvi. 1), a view adopted substantially by some modern critics (Strauss, Köstlin, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, pp. 68, 476). The Spirit was ever with and in our Lord as the Spirit of Holiness, but came at baptism as the Spirit of office and authority.

**10.** *he saw.*] The descent was witnessed also by John Baptist (St. John i. 32); but St. Mark's object is to shew that our Lord, as man, then saw the act, which marked the initiation of His own office, and sealed Him as the Christ.

*opened.*] Literally "rent," a graphic word, peculiar to St. Mark (cf. Isai. lxiv. 1). On the date of the Baptism, see note on Matt. iii.: the time of year is approximately determined by St. John's narrative. Between it and Easter there intervened forty days in the wilderness, the return thence to John Baptist, three days to the marriage at Cana, and some time "not many days" at Capernaum (see John ii. 12).

### 12-13. The Temptation.

St. Mark gives only a summary statement of this transaction, which, like the preceding one, he regards as introductory to the public ministry of our Lord.

**12.** *driveth him.*] The word indicates a sudden and forcible impulsion. St. Peter, who was present, attests the fact which

13 And he was there in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him.

14 Now after that John was put in prison, [h] Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God,

[h] Matt. 4. 12.

15 And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel.

16 [i] Now as he walked by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew his brother casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers.

[i] Matt. 4. 18.

---

came within his personal observation, that carried away by an irresistible impulse our Lord went at once to the desert, either the traditional Quarantania, see note on Matt. iv., and Farrar 'Life of Christ,' i. p. 119, or the arid plain adjoining the jungle which borders the Jordan, frequented by wild beasts.

13. *he was there in the wilderness.*] The repetition is emphatic: it forces attention to the fact that during forty days He underwent the searching process of temptation in utter solitude. The effect, and doubtless the object, of temptation, as permitted and purposed by the Spirit, was that every access to evil affections might be exposed to such a trial as should assay and thus attest the perfect soundness of Him in whom God was well pleased. The points of resemblance and difference in the temptation of the first and of the second man are equally striking and significant.

*the angels.*] Thus too St. Matthew, who shews that the ministration of angels followed the temptation.

14, 15. THE FIRST OFFICIAL ACT OF JESUS AS SON OF GOD. PUBLIC PREACHING.

14. *after that John was put in prison.*] Literally, "was delivered up." The word suggests a comparison with our Lord's betrayal (see note on St. Matt. xxvii. 2). There was a considerable interval between our Lord's Baptism and the imprisonment of John, which probably took place in the autumn. Our Lord appears to have passed most of that time in Judea. The record of His acts in that district is preserved exclusively by St. John, whose family seem to have resided chiefly at Jerusalem (see Caspari, 'Leben Jesu.')

*came into Galilee.*] Galilee was specially designated in prophecy as the scene of Divine manifestation (see note on St. Matt. iv. 14, ff.). Our Lord went at once into the very centre of the dominion of Herod, the persecutor of the Baptist.

*the gospel of the kingdom of God.*] The immediate manifestation of God's kingdom in power was the subject matter of our Lord's preaching in Galilee (see note at end of chapter).

15. *And saying.*] After "saying" St. Mark inserts the word "that"; this is a common idiom with our evangelists, but is noticeable here, because it indicates that St. Mark gives the subject matter, or general purport, of our Lord's teaching, not the *ipsissima verba* (Weiss, p. 53). Tischendorf in his last edition omits "and saying," but without sufficient authority.

*The time is fulfilled.*] The time predetermined (cf. Gal. iv. 2-4; Eph. i. 10) came to its end or completion when John Baptist finished his course. His imprisonment was therefore a critical epoch. St. Mark alone notices this important point; it bore directly upon his own plan, distinguishing sharply the period of announcement from that of fulfilment.

*the kingdom of God.*] St. Matthew has "the kingdom of Heaven": but in later Hebrew "Heaven" is used as equivalent in meaning to God. St. Mark wrote for Gentiles, to whom the expression would be strange.

*repent.*] So St. Matthew. St. Mark adds the evangelical condition. Faith in the Gospel, that is in the glad tidings of salvation, is thus demanded in connection with the first preaching of Jesus. The word "Gospel" is taken precisely in the same sense as in v. 1, not the subject matter, but the announcement; so that there is no room for the objection of Weiss and others, that it anticipates the language of the late Apostolic age.

We have thus in this one verse a pregnant summary of our Lord's preaching, the end of the preparatory period, the manifestation of God's kingdom, and the conditions of admission and acceptance.

16-20. THE CALL OF FOUR APOSTLES.

16. *Now as he walked.*] Rather, following the reading of the oldest MSS and versions, "as **He was passing** on by the sea of Galilee." The meaning appears to be that as our Lord came from the south, passing through Cana (John iv. 1, 6), He went by the seashore towards Capernaum, and on His way found four Disciples, whom He

17 And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.

18 And straightway they forsook their nets, and followed him.

19 And when he had gone a little farther thence, he saw James the *son* of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were in the ship mending their nets.

20 And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee in the ship with the hired servants, and went after him.

21 [k]And they went into Capernaum; and straightway on the sabbath day he entered into the synagogue, and taught.

22 [l]And they were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as

[k] Matt. 4. 13.
[l] Matt. 7. 28.

---

had previously chosen, occupied in their old calling (cf. John xxi. 3). St. Mark still keeps the brief, epitomising style of his introductory portion, and relates the call of these Disciples in the exact words used by St. Matthew, doubtless those of the formal Apostolical tradition. The omission of the circumstances of St. Peter's call, narrated fully by St. Luke, is a remarkable instance of the rule, observed by our Evangelist, of not giving prominence to details which reflect special distinction upon that Apostle.

*Simon.*] St. Mark uses this name exclusively up to ch. iii. 16: after that always Peter, with the characteristic exception "Simon, why sleepest thou?" (ch. xiv. 37; cf. Holtzmann, p. 284.)

**20.** *with the hired servants.*] This seems to mark a difference between the position of Zebedee's family, and that of Simon and Andrew. All Israelites had a legal right to fish in the sea of Tiberias ("un des bassins d'eau les plus poissonneux du monde," Renan, 'Vie de J.,' p. 148). Zebedee therefore, whose home appears to have been in Jerusalem, had a ship and hired servants there, probably under the management of his partners (Luke v. 10) during his absence, and would naturally go there with his sons before the great festivals, when a large supply would be needed for Jerusalem (see Caspari, 'Leben Jesu'). St. Mark alone notices the hired servants, a point which St. Peter would naturally record, but which would have less interest for the other Synoptists. Hilgenfeld, 'Einleitung,' p. 515, reckons this among passages evidently derived from an independent source, written or oral. Many indications of special interest in St. John's personal relations are found in this Gospel.

*went after him.*] The relation of the Disciples to Christ, as coming after Him, appears thus to be marked as the converse of the Baptist's, who went before Him.

21, 22. First Preaching at Capernaum.

**21.** *And they went into Capernaum.*] Rather, "they come into Capernaum." Our Lord and his four Disciples (a point noticed by St. Mark alone) thus make their entrance together—a very solemn act marking the commencement of His public teaching, as head of a community, then called first into germinal existence in the persons of the four. Two of the four, Simon and Andrew, already resided there. See v. 29.

The entrance does not seem to have taken place on the same day as the call; for St. Mark uses the historical present, which usually indicates a new course of action; and our Lord appears to have taken up His residence in St. Peter's house at once on the Sabbath day immediately after the first preaching in the synagogue (see v. 29). The call was on a week day, since the fishermen were engaged in their work.

*straightway.*] This marks the immediate commencement of His work. His first work was preaching, which began at once on the Sabbath day, probably the day after the call. See note on Matt. viii. 16.

*the sabbath day.*] The word is plural in the Greek, but commentators generally agree that one day is meant. The rendering of the A. V. in Luke iv. 31, "on the Sabbath days," is inconsistent.

*the synagogue.*] This synagogue was the gift of the centurion, whose striking history, related by St. Matthew ch. viii. 5-13, and St. Luke vii. 2-10, for some unknown reason is omitted by St. Mark. The ruins of a large synagogue at Tell Hum are described by Thomson and other travellers (see note on Matt. iv. 13): but the site of Capernaum is not certainly determined (cf. Caspari, 'Leben Jesu,' p. 70, and Dr. Tristram quoted on ch. iii. 13). Renan observes, "Il est douteux qu'on arrive jamais, sur ce sol profondément dévasté, à fixer les places où l'humanité voudrait venir baiser l'empreinte de ses pieds" ('Vie de J.,' p. 142).

**22.** *they were astonished.*] St. Matthew, ch. vii. 28, uses the same word, a very strong one, in describing the effect of our Lord's teaching, after the Sermon on the Mount. That discourse, which presents fully our

one that had authority, and not as the scribes.

m Luke 4. 33.

23 [m]And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out,

24 Saying, Let *us* alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God.

---

Lord's ethical and doctrinal system, so to speak, is specially marked by authority; St. Matthew had therefore good reason for reserving the statement for that occasion. St. Mark not less fittingly records the effect of the first appearance of our Lord as teacher.

*that had authority.*] This great characteristic comes out at once, shewing that the first discourse of our Lord had the same tone and spirit which pervades the Sermon on the Mount.

*not as the scribes.*] The Jewish scribes were certainly not wanting in self-assertion, or in the assumption of superiority to their hearers: but their teaching was avowedly based on tradition; no decision on points of law or casuistry, no interpretation of Scripture was received, unless it was sustained by reference to Rabbis recognised as depositaries of tradition. Our Saviour speaks in His own name; "I say unto you."

The agreement and difference of the synoptical statements in this matter are important as bearing upon the question of pre-existing written documents. As in many other passages, the agreement in the statement is exact, word for word, and is held to support the theory; but the memory of Orientals, accustomed to retain poems, narratives, and didactic compositions of enormous length (as for instance the whole of the Vedas, of the Homeric poems, of the Old Testament, and even of the Talmud) sufficiently accounts for verbal agreement, while the divergences in order and details indicate distinct sources of information. Here St. Matthew and St. Mark agree verbatim as to the statement, but differ as to the occasion; St. Luke differs from both as to the precise words.

23-27. THE FIRST PUBLIC MIRACLE, THE UNCLEAN SPIRIT EXPELLED.

From this point St. Mark's narrative, losing the epitomising character which has marked the introductory portion, and recurs at the close of his Gospel, becomes full of details. The first transaction brings out very prominently one leading characteristic, the special importance which he attaches to the effect of our Lord's manifestation upon evil spirits, the source of all moral and physical ills. He sees in it a special proof of his great thesis, Jesus is the Son of God. Thus Köstlin, 'Die Evangelien,' p. 313 (whose statement is adopted by Holtzmann, p. 474, Weizsäcker and other critics) observes, "Mastery over the supernatural powers of the evil one is represented by St. Mark, most decisively among the Evangelists, as the specific operation of Jesus." See note on ch. xvi. 18.

**23.** *And there was.*] Good MSS, one old version, and late editors agree in inserting "straightway:" St. Mark's object being to point out the immediate effect of Christ's preaching.

*with an unclean spirit.*] Literally "in an unclean spirit." The word indicates an immersion, so to speak, in a foul spiritual influence, of which the personality, though unquestionable (cf. Matt. xii. 43), is indistinct; observe the plural form used in the following verse.

*and he cried out.*] The unclean spirit is the real speaker, as is evident from the next verse; but the utterance is that of the man, who being in, *i.e.*, possessed by, the evil spirit becomes its mere instrument. In this respect a specific distinction may be observed in the mode of spiritual action in the case of true Prophets: in them inspiration does not supersede personal consciousness; they either speak their own words, or they deliver a message in the name and in the words of the LORD. This distinction is indicated in Greek by the words *μάντις* and *προφήτης*.

**24.** *Let us alone.*] The word so rendered is omitted in some of the oldest MSS and versions; it is kept by St. Luke, iv. 34: but whether to be retained or not it is not correctly rendered in the A.V., being simply interjectional, equivalent to ah! or ha! and common in classical poets, though rare in prose. Observe, the effect is spontaneous; our Lord says nothing specially calculated to call forth such an expression: the preaching of the truth throws the world of spiritual evil into a state of turmoil and alarm.

*what have we to do with thee.*] For the idiom cf. Jud. xi. 12, LXX, where it means that the person so addressed has no right to interfere with the speaker; and this meaning is here adopted by Weiss; the evil spirit resents the intrusion of a strange and hostile power into its own domain.

*art thou come to destroy us?*] Rather, **Thou art come to destroy us.** That is the object of the Lord's mission: He came to destroy

25 And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him.

26 And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him.

27 And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? what new doctrine *is* this? for with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him.

28 And immediately his fame spread abroad throughout all the region round about Galilee.

29 [a] And forthwith, when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John.

[a] Matt. 8. 14.

30 But Simon's wife's mother lay

---

the works of the devil: to crush the serpent's head: the evil ones recognise that fact, and cry out in despair. St. Matthew here, on another occasion (see ch. viii. 29), shews that the destruction, not effected at once, would be preceded by great torment.

*I know thee, &c.*] Or '**we know thee,**' so old MSS versions, and many early Fathers. In this statement lies a special proof of the real presence of evil spirits: a lunatic might conceivably have been thrown into a fit of frenzy by powerful preaching, but would not in that state have attained to a distinct consciousness of the nature of the Speaker.

*the Holy One.*] The special characteristic, which involved the ruin of the unholy ones, forced the avowal from their consciousness: Meyer. Weiss dwells on another aspect: they dreaded Him as the Messiah, who was in the highest sense consecrated or Holy: priests and prophets were such in a subordinate sense. The Son of God, being perfectly holy, executes the work of Holiness, the destruction of all unholiness.

St. Mark here and elsewhere (i. 34; iii. 11) is careful to bring out the higher knowledge of spirits, which enabled them to discern at once the significance of the personality of Jesus: in fact such recognition is only explicable by a personal indwelling of spirits fallen, but in their fall retaining knowledge.

**26.** *had torn him.*] A terrible convulsion, repeated on similar occasions, indicates the subtle intertwining of the evil agency with the man's consciousness and with the processes of his physical constitution.

*with a loud voice.*] As it were in antagonism to the command 'hold thy peace.' The cure, though perfect, is not effected without a crisis of agony: such is the general experience of persons raised suddenly out of a state of spiritual defilement and misery.

**27.** This verse is held by many critics to gain considerably by an alteration of the text, now generally adopted—(Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, McClellan, Scrivener, Introd. p. 482.) The rendering would in that case run thus: "and they were all astounded, so that they inquired, saying what is this? A new doctrine with authority! And He commandeth the unclean spirits and they obey Him." The word here rendered 'astounded' is peculiar to St. Mark (occurring only once elsewhere in the N.T.), and is used by him in connection with the first and the last miracles and with great spiritual manifestations, cf. ix. 15; x. 24, 32; xiv. 33; xvi. 5. The word *inquired* in the original is equivalent to the Hebrew *darash*, denoting deep interest and much searching. The whole passage brings out a new and different point from that presented by the received text: when the people saw the miracle they reverted at once to the previous and more important indication of a great manifestation, the main feature in His teaching which struck them being its authority. See however note at the end of the chapter.

**28.** The effect upon the whole district, not merely, as Weiss holds, the immediate neighbourhood of Capernaum, but all the surrounding provinces, is related by anticipation. Alford observes that "the two evangelists who relate this miracle first of all do not say that it was the first absolutely," a point of importance in reference to St. John ii. 1-11, where the effect of the first miracle is described as confined to the disciples.

29-34. The House of Simon.

**29.** *when they were come out, &c.*] Another reading, "He was come out," and "He entered," seems preferable, and indeed required by the last words of this verse: but the authorities are divided, and very nearly balanced. See note at the end of the chapter. Of this section Renan observes, "Ici tout est pris sur le vif; on sent qu'on est en présence des souvenirs." 'Les Évangiles,' p. 119.

*the house of Simon and Andrew.*] St. Matthew does not name Andrew, as joint owner of the house; and instead of Simon he has the more honourable designation Peter.

**30.** *Simon's wife's mother.*] Simon was probably the head of the family, since his wife had her mother residing with her. The wife of Peter is not mentioned by name in Scrip-

sick of a fever, and anon they tell him of her.

31 And he came and took her by the hand, and lifted her up; and immediately the fever left her, and she ministered unto them.

32 And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils.

33 And all the city was gathered together at the door.

34 And he healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils [1]to speak, because they knew him.

[1] Or, *to say that they knew him.*

35 And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed.

---

ture, but St. Paul tells us (1 Cor. ix. 5) that she accompanied her husband in his missionary work: and her martyrdom is attested by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vii. 736, see also Eus. H. E. iii. 30) whose account of the conduct of husband and wife is exceedingly beautiful and free from the monastic taint found in later writers. "They say that the blessed Peter, when he saw his wife led away to death, rejoiced that she was graciously called, and was returning to her home, and that calling her by name, he addressed her in words of encouragement and consolation, 'remember thou the Lord.' Such was the marriage of the Saints, and such their perfect state of mind towards their dearest. Thus also the Apostle 'he that is married as he that marrieth not,' holding that marriage should be free from weak passion, and inseparable from the love of the Lord." The same Father asserts positively that St. Peter had children (Strom. iii. 448, B.) For other indications of this see Tillemont, 'St. Pierre,' § 39.

*sick of a fever.*] Severe fevers are common in that district; there are marshes in the immediate neighbourhood, at Tabiga: see Thomson, 'Land and Book.' St. Luke, iv. 38, uses the expression 'a great fever,' *i. e.* typhoid.

**31.** *immediately.*] This word is omitted by Tischendorf, following his usual authorities; but it is constantly used by St. Mark, and is well supported. It is of importance, since recovery from typhoid fever is followed by prostration for a longer or shorter time: in this case there was an immediate restoration of strength.

**32.** *at even, when the sun did set.*] Not before sunset, for it was the Sabbath day. St. Matthew does not notice the day, thus leaving the cause of the delay till eventide unexplained. St. Mark is careful to observe after sunset (ἔδυσε, so Weiss following B D). The time between the breaking up of the Synagogue (between 3 and 4 P.M.), and sunset, would suffice for a dissemination of the rumour through the town, and *all* who needed healing were then brought.

**33.** *at the door.*] The house had a small court in front; but the people were probably assembled before the outer door in the wall. The whole adult male population would appear to have come together; no impossibility, if the house was situate in an open place; Capernaum was what the Greeks call a village-town (κωμόπολις).

The question whether our Lord resided in a house belonging to his family (see John ii. 12), or used St. Peter's house from this time when he was at Capernaum, is not decisively answered; the former view is held by Meyer; but the notices in Mark iii. 19 and 31 favour the latter, which seems on the whole more probable.

**34.** *many.*] St. Matthew says "all," stating, as usual, the general result in a condensed form. St. Mark's account applies to what was done on the same day. St. Luke notes that our Lord laid His hands on each, thus curing (θεραπεύων) them.

*and suffered not.*] The ejection of evil spirits was accompanied with a rebuke (St. Luke iv. 41) and a prohibition to speak; thus shewing the real meaning of the rebuke and command in v. 25.

*they knew him.*] Some good MSS followed by Westcott and Hort, add *to be the Christ.*

### 35-39. Departure from Capernaum, and First Missionary Journey.

**35.** *And in the morning.*] The words here used by the evangelist indicate a time before sunrise, while it was yet dark. Our Lord therefore left Capernaum on Sunday morning, immediately after the scene of popular excitement. It is suggested that He would not remain, lest the impression should be strengthened that it was His main object to heal bodily diseases, and we find throughout the Gospels numerous instances of similar withdrawals. The feelings which brought the whole city together were far from blameable; still they were not such as to leave the mind in the fittest state to receive spiritual instruction. We have however His own word to guide us; He went forth for the special purpose of preaching in the neighbouring district; see v. 38.

36 And Simon and they that were with him followed after him.

37 And when they had found him, they said unto him, All *men* seek for thee.

38 And he said unto them, Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also: for therefore came I forth.

39 And he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils.

40 [a]And there came a leper to him, beseeching him, and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.

[a] Matt. 8. 2.

41 And Jesus, moved with com-

---

*into a solitary place.*] Such intervals of lonely meditation and prayer accompanied or preceded most events of critical importance.

*prayed.*] Or 'He was praying,' indicating repeated or long continued prayer. This is important as the first special notice of our Lord's personal devotions, and as illustrating His own word (Matt. vi. 6).

36. *followed after him.*] Or "pursued after Him." The original word denotes an earnest, impetuous pursuit, as such characteristic of St. Peter. (In the oldest MSS and versions, and in late critical editions the verb is singular.) *They who were with him* would naturally include his brother and partners, the sons of Zebedee. St. Luke (iv. 42) tells us the "multitudes were seeking Him and came unto Him." St. Peter and the inmates of the house probably discovered his absence at daybreak, and set out in hot haste following His track: the multitudes which had assembled late on the previous evening, not being yet dispersed, would naturally be watching for Him, especially those who had sick friends; they would of course at once follow the disciples in their search.

38. *Let us go.*] The brief but clear notices in this verse and the following one indicate the extent of the first missionary journey, in which our Lord was attended by the first-called disciples. St. Mark's words indicate considerable duration and extent. He preached in their synagogues, therefore in different towns, and on successive Sabbaths. According to Josephus, Vit. 45, Galilee contained 204 villages and cities, of which the least had 15,000 inhabitants; doubtless an exaggeration, but one which even Josephus would not have ventured on, had not the district been exceedingly populous. St. Matthew's statement (ch. iv. 24) that His fame extended through all Syria implies that this circuit reached westward to the borders of Syria. St. Luke iv. 44 (according to the oldest MSS and versions) includes Judea, which Weiss accepts, and which from its very unexpectedness has a primâ facie presumption in its favour. Lewin (Fasti Sacri, § 1205) calculates that this circuit through the whole of Galilee must have occupied four or five months; so that our Lord's return to Capernaum would be in the spring. The next circuit began in May.

39. *and cast out devils.*] Or "the devils." This is peculiar to St. Mark. He alone presents the act as, next to preaching, a most prominent feature of our Lord's public ministry, and of His last charge to His apostles (ch. xvi. 17, where see note). To him, as to St. Peter and indeed to all early Christians it was a most striking attestation to His sovereignty over the spiritual world (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, Eph. vi. 12).

The rendering "devils" is not properly equivalent to the Greek; but it may be retained as generally accepted, and free from associations suggested by the word "demons."

40–45. The Healing of the Leper.

This is recorded by the three Synoptists, most fully by St. Mark. Leprosy, as a disease incurable and typical of sin, specially attested the need and the power of a Divine Healer. The time and place are not distinctly marked, but it must have been towards the close of the circuit, after the Sermon on the Mount, see Matt. viii. 1; not however in Capernaum, but as St. Luke (v. 12) says "in one of the cities" sc. of Galilee, which explains an incidental notice of St. Mark, see *v.* 45; not therefore at the very close, since after this miracle our Lord remained in desert places.

40. *a leper.*] St. Luke, the physician, says 'full of leprosy'; the disease was fully developed. From the connection of this verse with the preceding it may perhaps be inferred (Weiss) that the transaction took place in a synagogue and on the Sabbath day. A separate place was allotted to such lepers in synagogues. This view throws light on some difficult expressions, see note on v. 43.

*kneeling down.*] As a suppliant, and as to a man of God. St. Matthew uses a form denoting a repeated act.

*If thou wilt, thou canst.*] Full faith in the power of the Saviour, seems here to be combined with imperfect faith in His goodness. Bengel for once goes too far, calling it *fidem maturam*.

41. *moved with compassion.*] A great word,

passion, put forth *his* hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean.

42 And as soon as he had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed.

43 And he straitly charged him, and forthwith sent him away;

44 And saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

45 [b] But he went out, and began to publish *it* much, and to blaze abroad the matter, insomuch that Jesus could no more openly enter into the city, but was without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter.

[b] Luke 5. 15.

---

such as St. Mark loves to use, following doubtless St. Peter's account of his compassionate Master's acts.

*I will, be thou cleansed.*] Two words only in Greek (θέλω καθαρίσθητι), telling all that a suppliant needs to know. The brevity expresses the ready and full assent.

**42.** *departed from him.*] St. Matthew has "he was cleansed"; the word used by St. Luke indicates the departure of the evil thing. St. Mark has both words.

**43.** *straitly charged—sent him away.*] Two expressions here used by St. Mark are peculiar, and very strong: "And he sternly charged him and cast him out;" the expression generally denotes anger, indignation, or stern rebuke. It may be that the leper, by coming so near to our Lord as to be touched, violated the law, thus incurring just reproach. The other word "cast him out" evidently implies at least summary dismissal, if not expulsion from the synagogue. It is clear from our Lord's injunction "offer for thy cleansing" that the man up to that time was ceremonially unclean, and as such unfit to come into contact with members of the congregation.

**44.** *say nothing to any man.*] This is important as the first distinct intimation of our Lord's unwillingness to allow public attention to be diverted from His teaching to miracles, of which the purport would be but partially understood. The healing may have been witnessed by some members of the synagogue, though it probably took place after the close of service; but the prohibitior was intended to prevent the man from spreading the rumour on his way to Jerusalem.

**45.** *But he went out.*] *I.e.* out of the city, after leaving the synagogue. St. Luke does not adopt St. Mark's words, but substantially agrees with him. The result of the dissemination of the rumour, touching a special indication of Messianic power, was that our Lord found it no more expedient to enter into the cities of Galilee; but winding up the general circuit, He retired to some lonely places, where according to St. Matthew (iv. 25), great multitudes followed him from all parts of Palestine. St. Mark's last word "from every quarter" is thus best illustrated.

The first chapter of St. Mark thus completes one great section of our Lord's history, extending over some twelve months from His Baptism. His personal influence, both as a Preacher and the Master of the natural and spiritual world, had made itself felt throughout Galilee: his fame had reached far into Syria, Decapolis, and Southern Palestine. Hitherto no spirit of opposition seems to have been manifested. No mention has been made as yet of Pharisees, of Herodians, or of the Scribes as taking part against Him, though they must have shared the surprise of the people at the character of His teaching, and have felt indignant at their openly declared preference. It is a period of rapid advance and uninterrupted triumph: a foreshadowing of the future glory of the kingdom of God.

The chapter also throws great light on the special character of St. Mark's Gospel, and its relations to the other Synoptists. We have in the beginning, extreme compression, short summaries of important transactions, corresponding remarkably with the close of the Gospel: but withal in the very shortest accounts we invariably find some special point proving that the writer did not merely copy or condense the narrative of previous writers, but derived his information from one who was personally acquainted with the facts.

On the other hand we have fuller and more distinct accounts of some transactions than are given in the other evangelists, and, as critics of sound judgment have shewn, a more complete and intelligible narrative, especially in reference to the first six months of our Lord's public ministry.

The most remarkable omission is that of our Lord's discourses, especially of the great Sermon on the Mount. St. Peter may have given separate courses of catechetical instruction, in one relating the events of our Lord's life, in others expounding His doctrinal teaching, or specially dealing with the fulfilment of

prophecy. If so, the substance of the former only is given in this Gospel. For the latter we must study the apostolic epistles, written for the most part before the publication of the Gospels. It was indeed fitting that the epistles should first awaken, direct, and mould the mind of Christians, setting forth doctrinal views of our Lord's Person and work; and that the Gospels should then be published giving full information of events by which the Person and work were manifested, that all "might know the certainty of those things wherein they had been (catechetically) instructed." Luke i. 4.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 1, 2, 4, 14, 27, and 29.

1. *Son of God* (υἱοῦ Θεοῦ).] These words are rejected by Tischendorf in his last edition, in deference to Codex ℵ, *i.e.* the Sinaitic MS: a mere oversight of the transcriber, as more cautious critics rightly maintain (see Weiss, and Scvin, 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1874, p. 569). It is found in all other uncial, and nearly all cursive MSS, including those which generally agree with Codex ℵ, and in all ancient versions. The argument from citations in the Fathers is of great weight when their authority is supported by early versions and good MSS, but not otherwise. In this case the omission of the words in Irenæus, Origen, Jerome, and others may be accounted for, as having no direct bearing upon their arguments.

2. *in the prophets.*] Nearly all modern editors adopt a different reading—"in Isaiah the prophet," ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ. To this reading there are the following objections —(1.) St. Mark in no other passage quotes any prophet, excepting in his record of our Lord's discourses, and that once only, ch. vii. 6, for in ch. xiii. 14 the name Daniel is held by all critics to be an interpolation from St. Matt. xxiv. 15. (2.) The writer must have known that the two prophecies here quoted come from two distinct sources, since that from Malachi is translated direct from the Hebrew; that from Isaiah is taken from the Septuagint: it is therefore to the last degree improbable that St. Mark should have attributed both to the same prophet. (3.) Both prophecies are cited by St. Matthew and St. Luke; the second prophecy in the same connection (St. Matt. iii. 3; St. Luke iii. 4), where the name of Isaiah is given; the former prophecy in our Lord's description of John the Baptist (St. Matt. xi. 10; St. Luke vii. 27), without the name of Malachi. A copyist familiar with those passages might not unnaturally introduce the well-known name of Isaiah into the text; probably he would find it in the margin; but that St. Mark, or his teacher St. Peter, should have confounded Malachi with Isaiah is scarcely conceivable. Without an overwhelming weight of external evidence it would seem unreasonable to accept a reading open to objections so serious.

The evidence, however, is sufficient to prove a very early fluctuation. The uncial MSS are divided; thirteen read ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, *sc.* A E F G* H K M P S U V Γ Π; five have the name Isaiah, four (ℵ B L Δ) with the article, one (D) without it: the four belong to one school of recension; they are of high authority, but are not, strictly speaking, independent witnesses. The great majority of cursive MSS omit the name Isaiah; about twenty-six insert it. Upon the whole, the authority of MSS must be regarded as doubtful; though the majority of critics, including Scrivener, attach most weight to those which insert the name.

A corresponding variation is found in the ancient versions. The Italic, Vulgate, and Coptic agree with ℵ B L; but the Syriac (Peshito), Armenian, Æthiopic, and Arabic agree with A and the other MSS. It may, perhaps, be inferred that the reading "Isaiah" was generally adopted in the recension of the Alexandrian school, but not in that of the schools of Syria and Palestine.

The testimony of early Fathers is doubtful. Irenæus quotes the passage thrice. Twice he omits the name Isaiah, and recognises the reading "in the prophets." In book iii. x. 6, "quemadmodum scriptum est in prophetis;" thus again, in the same book, xvi. 3, where the context, quoted in the note at the end of this gospel, proves decisively that this was the reading in the original Greek (see Massuet's note *in loc. ap.* Stieren, vol. ii. p. 880). Once, however, Irenæus has "in Isaiah the prophet," both in the old Latin version, and in the Greek original, which is preserved, though in a very inaccurate form, by Anastasius Sinaita (see the notes in Stieren's edition, lib. iii. c. xi. 8, p. 467). It must be inferred either that Irenæus had two different texts before him, which seems unlikely, or that one or other of the passages is corrupt; if so, as Massuet proves, it must be that which inserts the name.

On the other hand, there is a general agreement among the Fathers, from Origen onwards, that "Isaiah" was the received reading—a fact which has great weight, and would be conclusive, were the testimonies independent of each other. Eusebius and Jerome hold it to be an error of the transcriber; the former says γράφεως ἐστὶ σφάλμα,

the latter, as usual, adopting his words, "nomen Isaiæ putamus additum scriptoris vitio." It should also be noticed that three Fathers who have the name Isaiah omit the quotation from Malachi altogether—*sc.* Basil, Epiphanius, and Victorinus, cited by Tischendorf.

The natural conclusion would seem to be that the name of Isaiah was introduced into the text of this Gospel early in the second century; but that it could not have been in the original of St. Mark.

Some critics who accept it, but are unwilling to impute a very serious error to the Evangelist, regard the prophecy of Malachi as merely introductory to the principal quotation from Isaiah. This is unsatisfactory, since the prophecy of Malachi has a very special importance, both as giving the words of God the Father, and as being applied to John the Baptist by our Lord.

The reading ἐν τῷ 'Ησαίᾳ adopted by Tischendorf and others is singular, inasmuch as the name 'Ησαΐας occurs twenty-four times in the N. T., but never with the article.

**4.** Fritzsche follows Erasmus in taking ἀρχὴ as agreeing with ἐγένετο: in that case the construction would be, "The beginning of the announcement of Jesus Christ the Son of God (in accordance with prophecy) was John, he who baptized—and proclaimed." Fritzsche urges with great force the objections to other constructions, and Holtzmann agrees with him.

**14.** The generality of modern critics, following, as usual, one class of MSS, omit τῆς βασιλείας "the kingdom;" thus Meyer, Alford, Tischendorf, Weiss. The MSS are ℵ B L, which are nearly always in accordance; a few cursives, valued highly as agreeing generally with those uncials; among the ancient versions, some copies of the old Italic, the Coptic and the Armenian. The authorities for the *textus receptus* are weighty, the majority of uncials, including A D, which represent different recensions, and nearly all cursives, some of the oldest MSS of Italic Versions, the Vulgate, the Syriac of Schaaf and the MSS of the Peshito, the Æthiopic and Gothic. This is a good instance of the difference between the recensions. In favour of the received text it is to be observed (1) that the expression "the Gospel of God," used by St. Paul (Rom. i. i. 16; xv. 16; 2 Cor. xi. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 2;) and by St. Peter (1 iv. 17), does not occur in the Evangelists; (2) that, as it was observed in the footnote, the kingdom of God was the subject matter of our Lord's preaching; cf. also our Lord's own words, Luke iv. 43; and (3) that the explanation of the sentence without "the kingdom" is strained and improbable; it would run thus, the Gospel of the Son of God was preached by John Baptist; he announced the coming of Christ: the Gospel of God was preached by Christ; He announced the coming of God. But this is a statement not found in the Gospels. The meaning of 'the Gospel of God' in St. Paul and St. Peter is rather, the Gospel given by God.

**27.** In support of the text followed by the A. V. it should be observed that the reading lately adopted is found only in one class of MSS, ℵ B L, and 33, 102 (both agreeing closely with B), and with a slight modification, αὕτη after καινή, in seven other cursive MSS; that it is not supported by the Coptic version, which generally agrees with those MSS; that it seems unknown to the early Fathers; and lastly that it somewhat differs from St. Mark's tone in speaking of demoniacal cases. Keim has a striking remark, which would lose its point if this reading were adopted "It was the lot of the greatest personality which ever appeared in the world, of the most sublime discourse which ever sounded in the world, to be reckoned as less grand, noble, heavenly than the outward result presented to their senses." ('Geschichte Jesu,' ii. 287.) While disposed to acquiesce in the judgment of critics, especially as representing different schools, we may hesitate to regard the question as finally settled in face of these objections. The absolute predominance of one recension, that of B, supported by ℵ, scarcely an independent witness, and by L, of the same school and of secondary authority, seems open to grave objection. Here, too, it may be added that the received text agrees closely with Luke iv. 36.

**29.** The variations here are interesting. ℵ and L agree with A C and the generality of uncial and cursive MSS, and with the Coptic, some of the Syriac, the Vulgate, and Gothic versions: they support the Textus receptus, and are followed by Tischendorf. On the other side are B and D, independent witnesses, the early Italic, and some versions of less authority. The internal evidence is also doubtful; on the one hand the singular suits the context, on the other it may possibly for that reason have been substituted for the plural. Westcott and Hort leave it as doubtful.

## CHAPTER II.

1 *Christ healeth one sick of the palsy,* 14 *calleth Matthew from the receipt of custom,* 15 *eateth with publicans and sinners,* 18 *excuseth his disciples for not fasting,* 23 *and for plucking the ears of corn on the sabbath day.*

AND again [c] he entered into Capernaum after *some* days; and it was noised that he was in the house.

[c] Matt. 9. 1.

2 And straightway many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive *them*, no, not so much as about the door: and he preached the word unto them.

3 And they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four.

4 And when they could not come nigh unto him for the press, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken *it* up, they let

---

CHAP. II.—1-12. THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM; THE HEALING OF THE PARALYTIC, AND THE FIRST OFFENCE.

This passage marks a great epoch, indicated most distinctly in St. Mark's Gospel. From this time we find progressive manifestations of power, and claims to authority, beginning with forgiveness of sin; and on the other hand progressive indications of antagonism, resting here on doctrinal grounds, and at the same time a clearer recognition of our Lord's nature, and stronger attachment on the part of His disciples.

1. *he entered.*] See critical Note.

*after some days.*] Literally "after days," which implies a considerable interval; in this case months had certainly elapsed. See note at the end of the first chapter.

*it was noised.*] Literally "it was heard;" the rumour spread rapidly that *He was in the house*, or "**that He is at home:**" in the house which was known to be His home in Capernaum, probably that of St. Peter. See note on i. 33.

2. *straightway many were gathered together.*] From St. Luke v. 17 we learn that many were present, not only from other cities of Galilee, but from Judea, and specially Jerusalem. He mentions Pharisees and teachers of the law, the latter being also noticed by St. Mark further on, verse 5. This is of importance, indicating the true leaders of an antagonism as yet latent. The scribes or lawyers may have been sent from Jerusalem with the special view of watching our Lord's proceedings. See note on ch. iii. 22. The word *straightway* is omitted in two of the oldest MSS, but rests on good authority.

*there was no room, &c.*] The house probably resembled in its general structure and arrangements that of which an illustrative sketch is given by Thomson, 'Land and Book,' pp. 358, 359. If so, it consisted of a single story with low flat roof covered with tiles (cf. Luke v. 19); one large central room in the front of this house, opening upon a court surrounded by a wall, in which was the entrance door. In the front room, elevated a few steps above the court, was our Lord, surrounded by His disciples; others who had a marked position, such as the lawyers, were seated near Him; the outer court was completelv thronged. The roof was usually accessible by a stair on the outside of the house, and could be approached without passing through the court (cf. xiii. 15). Bishop Wordsworth, on verse 4, says that the roof might be the covering of an interior colonnade surrounding the atrium, or court; but this implies a house of dimensions and character unsuitable to the station of St. Peter, or of our Lord's family. It has again been suggested (Weiss) that the room in which our Lord taught was the upper chamber (ὑπερῷον), but to this the same objection applies, such a room being found only in houses of considerable size; nor would our Lord's teaching if given in an upper chamber have been heard by the multitude.

*he preached the word unto them.*] Rather "**He was speaking the word unto them,**" the word which is generally rendered "preached" is not used in this passage. The use of "the word" in this sense seems to be Petrine. Cf. 1 Peter i. 23, 25; ii. 2; iii. 1; and Acts x. 36, 37.

3. The circumstantial details, omitted by St. Matthew, which are given by St. Mark and St. Luke, supplement and explain each other. St. Luke mentions the ascent to the roof; St. Mark notices the removal of the covering, which St. Luke adds was of tiles. Then, digging through the ceiling, the bearers let the pallet-bed down into the middle of the large central room.

4. *come nigh unto him*, or "bring *the man* near," so some late editions, following as usual one set of MSS. The A.V. has abundant authority.

*when they had broken it up.*] Literally 'having dug out,' sc. an entrance. But the idiom in the A.V. is correct.

down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay.

5 When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.

6 But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts,

7 Why doth this *man* thus speak blasphemies? [d]who can forgive sins but God only?

[d] Job. 14. 4. Isai. 43. 25.

8 And immediately when Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts?

9 Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, *Thy* sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk?

10 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the sick of the palsy,)

11 I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house.

12 And immediately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion.

13 And he went forth again by the

---

*the bed.*] A thin mattress, or pallet, just large enough for a man to lie upon. The Greek word here used is provincial (retained in French as "grabat"), it occurs in St. Mark and St. John, but not elsewhere in the New Testament.

**5.** *Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.*] Or, "**child, thy sins are forgiven.**" St. Matthew and St. Mark have the tender word "child" (St. Luke "man"); St. Matthew has also "be of good cheer," a touching expression, such as our Lord was wont to use. There is a slight variation in the form of the word rendered "be forgiven;" the greater number of MSS (including some which often differ) have the past tense, an authoritative declaration of forgiveness already granted as a reward or result of true faith. Two points are specially noticeable: (1) the spiritual relief is first given—this accords with a Hebrew maxim quoted by Schoettgen (and Keim, ii. 175), "no sick man is healed of his disease until all his sins have been forgiven him;" (2) our Lord here for the first time gives, not promises as a future gift, the remission of sins, which John the Baptist had announced.

**7.** The process of thought is given by St. Mark and St. Luke; St. Matthew states their conclusion in two words, "this man blasphemeth" (οὗτος, contemptuously). Another reading, adopted by critical editors, Tischendorf, Hort and Westcott, is even more forcible, "Why doth this man speak thus? He blasphemeth."

**8, 9.** The words of our Lord are given, as usual, without any modification of sense by the three Synoptists, but with slight variation of expression, proving on the one hand the identity of apostolical tradition, but not confirming the view that it was previously preserved in writing.

The immediate result of the transaction was a general increase of faith among the people: the Scribes were silenced, but not convinced, and must have left the house with a deep rankling sense of discomfiture. In fact nothing short of the knowledge that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," fully explains the words and acts of our Lord. Volkmar observes "Christ proves that He has rightful authority to forgive sins by the marvellously great power with which His word raises the half-dead sinner from his bed of sin and pain, and enables him to carry it away, and to go forth as a sound man, joyously doing good works in the places where he had been so miserable." ('Die Evangelien,' p. 129.)

13-17. THE CALL OF LEVI THE PUBLICAN; CONTACT WITH SINNERS; THE SECOND OFFENCE.

**13.** *he went forth again.*] This expression indicates the beginning of a second missionary circuit. The time is not exactly determined, but it was probably after the Passover (see notes on i. 38, and ii. 23). Our Lord may have remained some time at Capernaum, where the great crowd of strangers would need instruction. The direction of our Lord's journey was probably southwards along the sea shore. The high road from Damascus to Acco passed through the plain of Gennesaret, and the toll, or custom-house, would of course be on it: some suppose that it was near the entrance of Tiberias; the city in which Levi resided must have been one of considerable size, since many publicans were present at the banquet which he gave on his conversion. There are, however,

sea side; and all the multitude resorted unto him, and he taught them.

14 [e] And as he passed by, he saw Levi the *son* of Alphæus sitting [1] at the receipt of custom, and said unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed him.

[e] Matt. 9. 9.
[1] Or, *at the place where the custom was received.*

15 And it came to pass that, as Jesus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him.

16 And when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners?

17 When Jesus heard *it*, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

18 [f] And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast: and

[f] Matt. 9. 14. Luke 5. 33.

---

serious objections to the assumption that the transaction took place at Tiberias. The disciples of John Baptist were present, a very unlikely thing at Tiberias, considering that it was a residence of Herod Antipas; nor were the stricter Pharisees likely to be there, it being regarded as ceremonially unclean.

*all the multitude.*] A point noticed by St. Mark only, important as illustrating our Lord's method of teaching, which was not confined to the synagogues (i. 39), or the house, but often given in the open air; especially, as it would seem, by the shore of the lake, which is level and well adapted for the purpose.

**14.** This verse is given verbatim by the three Synoptists, with a marked exception. Instead of Levi, son of Alphæus (omitted by St. Luke), the first Gospel has "a man called Matthew." The doubt as to identity was first raised, as it would seem, by Origen, c. Cels. i.13; see note below. The expression "called," which is peculiar to St. Matthew's Gospel, probably implies that Matthew was a second name, equivalent probably to Theodotus, or Deodatus, *i.e.* 'given of God.'

**15.** *in his house.*] St. Luke explains this, "Levi made a great reception feast (δοχή) in his house." St. Matthew omits the word "his," yet clearly intimates the fact (see Professor Blunt's remark quoted on Matt. ix. 10), dwelling chiefly on the circumstance that many publicans and persons of bad character were there brought into contact with our Lord. St. Mark notices, what the others omit, that on this occasion these publicans and sinners followed our Lord in great numbers. Weiss supposes that, according to St. Matthew, they followed Him to His own house; Reuss, that the accounts refer to different occasions and persons; both critics disregard the plain statements of the evangelists.

**16.** *the scribes and Pharisees.*] The Pharisees are now mentioned for the first time: they had probably been attracted by the personal holiness of our Lord, and were doubtless the first to remonstrate against an act which seemed to them inconsistent with such a character. Another reading, "the Scribes of the Pharisees," that is, the Scribes who belonged to that party, is adopted by Tischendorf, and accepted by late editors and translators, McClellan and Davidson. N.B. This has the authority of four of the oldest MSS, one (D) being an independent witness, and of one old version, the Coptic, not, however, in the printed editions. It certainly gives a correct view of the circumstances.

*with publicans and sinners.*] Or, as some read, "with the sinners and publicans;" and at the end of the verse "with the publicans and the sinners." Our Lord's answer touches the great point, contact with sinners.

**17.** *I came not, &c.*] Or "I came not to call righteous men, but sinners." "To repentance" is omitted in late critical editions. It may have been inserted from St. Luke.

The second offence, like the first, would seem to have been met so as to silence, if not to satisfy, the objectors.

18-22. THE QUESTION OF FASTING, GIVING OCCASION TO THE THIRD OFFENCE.

**18.** *The disciples . . . fast.*] Rather, "**the disciples of John and the Pharisees were fasting.**" The Pharisees and the disciples of John were fasting at the time in question, not improbably on the same day as that on which Matthew gave the feast. Why they were then fasting is a matter of conjecture. John the Baptist was then in prison at Machærus; but the mention of the Pharisees implies that it was not on his account that the fast was then observed; nor on the other hand is it at all probable that it was a public fast-day, which being legal would not have been neglected by the

they come and say unto him, Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?

19 And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast.

20 But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days.

21 No man also seweth a piece of [1]new cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made worse.

[1] Or, *raw* or, *unwrought*.

22 And no man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred:

---

great Teacher: it seems more probable that the banquet was given on one of the two weekly fast-days observed by the Pharisees (see St. Luke xviii. 12), but not enjoined by the law: this meets all the points, the day, the frequent fasting, and the expostulation.

The combination of John's disciples with the Pharisees is held to indicate a great and deplorable change, the Baptist having inculcated utterly different principles from those of the mere legalists. Keim (vol. ii. pp. 365-6) has remarks worth attention as coming from such a writer; he suggests that there was probably a movement of jealousy on the part of John's disciples; he treats with just contempt objections made against the historical character of the transaction; and fully recognises the depth and force of our Lord's words.

20. *shall be taken away from them.*] A painful, violent severance is thus intimated, referring at once to what had been done to John Baptist, and to what awaited our Lord Himself and His disciples. No question is raised as to the genuineness of these words —an important point, since they contravene some strong assertions as to the gradual and late indications of the end of our Lord's career: these words were spoken in the very midst of His early triumphs. Thus, too, his death was first distinctly foretold immediately after the glory of the Transfiguration.

*in those days.*] Or, "**in that day;**" not "in those days," a reading derived from St. Luke. The concurrence of independent MSS here is conclusive as to the reading.

21. *No man also.*] The oldest MSS omit "*also.*" The whole passage may be rendered more correctly thus, "**No man sews a patch of undressed stuff on an old garment, otherwise the filling up** (or the completeness) **takes from it—the new from the old —and a worse rent is made.**" The patch consists of a piece of new undressed material, rough and strong, which holds fast, while at the least wrench the old cloth gives way. By *the filling up* is meant the patch itself, which covers a hole or defect in the cloth. It is sometimes explained to mean that the patch would stretch, and thus tear the old cloth; more probably it would shrink when exposed to the sun, and thus at once cause a rent. If this last view be correct, we have a new point connecting the two illustrations: the patch spoils the garment by shrinking, the new wine bursts the skins by swelling; thus new customs fall short of the old, or go beyond them, in either case, when unseasonably introduced, causing rents, schisms, and inflicting serious damage. A very striking rendering is proposed by Professor Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 325: "The completeness takes away from the garment, the new completeness of the old garment."

Some differences of interpretation indicate imperfect appreciation of our Lord's method in teaching: He passes at once from the mere outer occasion to inner principles of universal import. What the Pharisees might do is comparatively unimportant; but the Disciples—still Jews—are taught on the one hand what is the true principle of fasting, which is in itself right and natural, so far as it is a genuine expression of grief, as for sin, for loss of Divine grace, or when it is used for the subjugation of passions antagonistic to the Spirit: on the other hand, they learn that the first work is always that of internal renovation, not of outward form: with a new nature new habits will come naturally; an attempt to anticipate will but cause disturbance and damage.

22. *old bottles.*] Or **skins.** (See note on St. Matthew.) The clause may be rendered, according to the best MSS, "**otherwise the wine bursts the skins, and the wine perishes and the skins.**" The words which follow are omitted by Tischendorf, and even by McClellan, and are supposed to be taken from the other Evangelists; but they are found in the great majority of MSS and ancient versions. See Scrivener, 'Introd. to Crit. N. T.,' p. 438, note 1.

but new wine must be put into new bottles.

[Matt. 12. 1]

23 [g] And it came to pass, that he went through the corn fields on the sabbath day; and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn.

24 And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the sabbath day that which is not lawful?

25 And he said unto them, Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him?

26 How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and did eat the shewbread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them which were with him?

27 And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath:

28 Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.

---

23-28. FOURTH OFFENCE; CHARGE OF SABBATH-BREAKING.

**23.** *And it came to pass.*] St. Mark gives here no indication of a connection with the preceding transaction; but as the banquet was given on a week-day—perhaps on Friday (see note on v. 18)—this may have occurred on the following day.

*that he went through.*] Or "**that He was passing along through the corn fields.**" The meaning seems to be that He was going through a field by a path alongside the corn, now in full ear.

*on the sabbath day.*] This is one of the passages in the Gospels which mark a distinct and certain point of time. The corn in that district is ripe in May, when Thomson ('Land and Book') observed people plucking and rubbing ears of wheat. The Sabbath is called by St. Luke "the second-first," an expression which most probably means the first Sabbath in the second month, Iyar, which in A.D. 30 began in May.

*began, as they went.*] Lit., "began to make way, plucking the ears." The meaning, as formerly accepted, would be that the Disciples began, as they went on, to pluck the ears of corn, being hungry, as St. Matthew says, and as St. Luke tells us, rubbing them in order to clear them of husks. This fully accounts for the special charge of the Pharisees which our Lord meets specifically in His answer, referring exclusively to the use of food. Another view of the meaning is discussed in the Note at the end of the chapter.

**24.** *And the Pharisees.*] This is the first notice of offence taken by the Pharisees at a breach in their so-called "hedge" of the law, *i.e.* rules laid down to prevent encroachments upon it (see 'Pirke Aboth,' § 1); it is important, shewing the minuteness of the rules then laid down for the observance of the Sabbath. We owe to Pharisaic scrupulosity the first discussion of the principle of Sabbath observances, and the decision that what is needful is permissible.

**27.** *The sabbath, &c.*] This great saying, preserved by St. Mark alone, sets forth two points, equally to be borne in mind:—1. The Sabbath was made for man; it must therefore be valued and used as a gift, a pledge of the Divine goodness, bringing with it present rest, and an anticipation of eternal peace. 2. Man is not to be sacrificed to it; what is needful must be done. Further applications will be drawn out by other cavils: here the fundamental principle is laid down once for all in the beginning of the controversy, which went on in Galilee and Jerusalem till it issued in a complete rupture.

**28.** The authority of Christ is thus asserted over the whole ceremonial law, which culminates in the Sabbath.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 1, 14, 23.

**1.** McClellan and Dr. Davidson have "when he was entered," following some late critical editions, on the authority of three uncial MSS, א B L (D is really doubtful, having καὶ before ἠκούσθη, and in its Latin translation "intravit"). The construction so presented is ungrammatical, a point not coming out in the English; this may not supply a conclusive argument against the reading; but the meaning is less suitable to the context.

Tischendorf is wrong in quoting the Coptic as supporting his reading; it has, "and he entered again."

**14.** Tischendorf quotes Origen, tom. i. p. 376, as referring to this passage; a more important reference, however, is found in tom. iii. 18, where see the Benedictine note. Origen's object was to refute Celsus (who spoke of the apostles as common fellows, publicans, &c.), and he very unfairly denies that Levi, or Lebes, the publican, was an apostle: a statement in which he is inconsistent with himself, since in the introduction to Romans, tom. iv. p. 460, he asserts the identity of Levi with St. Matthew; and again of Lebbæus with Thaddæus and Judas, "quem Matthæus Lebbæum, et Marcus Thaddæum dixit, Lucas Judam Jacobi scripsit." The translation of the last passage is by Rufinus, and in such a matter can be depended upon.

**23.** Many late commentators, including Bishop Wordsworth and McClellan, Meyer and Holtzmann, agree in adopting a very different interpretation, viz., that the disciples were making a way through the cornfields by plucking the ears of corn. This rests on the meaning attached to ὁδὸν ποιεῖν, which in classic Greek would be "to make a way," not simply "to go on." But St. Mark does not write classic Greek, and here probably adopts a Latin idiom, so frequent in his Gospel as to be a recognised characteristic, ὁδὸν ποιεῖν being exactly equivalent to "*iter facere*," used here in the old Italic, Cod. Vercell. Jerome has "progredi." For this idiom there is, moreover, the authority of the LXX in Jud. xvii. 8, ποιῆσαι ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, "to pursue his journey." It must also be observed that there is good authority for the reading ὁδοποιεῖν, *sc.* B G H with four cursives of high character. Passing on to the sense, is it to be supposed that the Disciples would go out of their way (for it is not supposed that our Lord made His way in this manner) to commit a serious trespass, which on any day would be legally punishable, and as such would need no reference to the Sabbatical law, which was exclusively concerned with acts at other times legal? No plea of necessity could be urged, or, if urged, accepted; nor is it suggested by our Lord's answer. Again, what connection is there between plucking the ears of corn and making a pathway? Had they been represented as treading down the stalks the case would have been different, and would have called for a very different answer from our Lord. The offence given was evidently the preparation of food on the Sabbath. St. Matthew and St. Luke give the explanation, which St. Mark assumes as self-evident: the former states the motive, "to eat;" the latter describes the act, "rubbing with their hands," this being regarded as a specific violation of traditional law.

---

## CHAPTER III.

*1 Christ healeth the withered hand, 10 and many other infirmities: 11 rebuketh the unclean spirits: 13 chooseth his twelve apostles: 22 convinceth the blasphemy of casting out devils by Beelzebub: 31 and sheweth who are his brother, sister, and mother.*

AND [a] he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand.

[a] Matt. 12. 9.

---

CHAP. III.—1-6. THE FIFTH OFFENCE; A SECOND CASE OF HEALING ON THE SABBATH.

This section is closely connected with the preceding; it completes the first series of conflicts, terminating with a formal resolution of the Pharisees, in combination with the Herodians, to bring about the destruction of the Saviour.

**1.** *And he entered again.*] This took place on a later occasion, but probably in the synagogue at the same place on the next Sabbath. St. Matthew has "into *their* synagogue," evidently referring to the Pharisees, who had been offended by the act just narrated. The feelings of suspicion described in the next verse are thus naturally accounted for; in fact without that notice we could scarcely understand why they should be watching Him at that special time, since He was in the habit of preaching weekly. On the city where this transaction probably occurred see note on v. 7. Lewin holds that the events related in John v. took place just before this occurrence. This is doubtful, a more probable time for those events being before our Lord's return to Capernaum (ch. ii. 1); but in either case there is reason to believe that the state of feeling among the dominant party in Jerusalem coincided with that of the Scribes and Pharisees in Galilee; and it is not improbable that the Pharisees here mentioned were visitors from Jerusalem, coming down, it may be, for the special purpose of watching our Lord's proceedings.

2 And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the sabbath day; that they might accuse him.

3 And he saith unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth.

4 And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace.

5 And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the [1]hardness of their

[1] Or, *blindness.*

---

*the synagogue.*] The article is omitted in two MSS usually followed by Tischendorf, but it rests on good authority. The omission might imply that another place was spoken of.

*withered.*] The A. V. has the same word here, and in St. Matthew; but there is a slight difference in the original: St. Mark has a word which means "dried up," not a congenital or organic defect, but the result of disease. St. Matthew has a word which means "dry," which is quite consistent with St. Mark's account, though not so definite. St. Luke, however, agrees with St. Matthew, a point noticeable as an exception to Bishop Marsh's rule accepted by Professor Westcott ('Introd.' p. 194). In both those Evangelists the word stands, emphatically, at the end of the clause. Such minute distinctions are of some importance as bearing upon the style and mutual relations of the Evangelists. St. Mark, as usual, chooses the more graphic word; St. Luke again, though content to notice the fact of the dryness, observes with his usual accuracy as a surgeon that it was the right hand which was affected.

2. *And they watched him.*] The word "watched" is scarcely strong enough; the original denotes jealous, perverse, uncandid observation; the watching of one already hostile. The word occurs but seldom, and only in passages where perverse intention is indicated. (Luke vi. 7, xiv. 1; Acts ix. 24; Gal. iv. 10; see also Luke xvii. 20.)

*whether he would heal.*] They had already a proof that He permitted His disciples to prepare food on the Sabbath, but were aware that the plea of necessity would be legally admissible, and, moreover, that that was not His own act. If he healed on the Sabbath day they would have a clearer case, since medical treatment on the Sabbath was not allowed by scrupulous Sabbatarians, save in critical and urgent attacks of disease. Work, as prohibited under pain of death by the law (see Exod. xxxi. 13-17), was held to include every act not absolutely necessary, or connected with Divine worship. According to St. Matthew, they put the question to Him directly and openly (see note *in loc.*); but St. Mark's account, followed by St. Luke, is probably more exact. St. Matthew, as usual, fixes attention exclusively upon the question which was then to be settled.

3. *Stand forth.*] Lit. "Arise into the midst:" the man was sitting in his place as a member of the congregation, and is bidden to stand up and come forward into the open space in front of the speaker; there all would see him. St. Mark and St. Luke omit the argument by which our Lord proves the inconsistency of his opponents. See Matth. xii. 10-12.

4. *And he saith.*] While the man is standing before them, so that all could see the withered hand, our Lord puts the question, which St. Matthew omits here, but to which he refers in verse 12. He puts it in a form which, as the Pharisees themselves felt, admitted but of one answer. If the clause "is it lawful (or permissible) to do good on the Sabbath-days?" stood alone, it might be met by the reply,—No, not if it cannot be done without breaking a positive law; but by adding the alternative "or to do evil," our Lord gave another direction to their thoughts. It is questioned what is here meant specially by doing evil. It may mean that to leave a man in a state of suffering, from which a word might deliver him, would be an evil act; or our Lord might address the Pharisees as conscious of an evil intent, "which is truly lawful to do a beneficent act, or to seek the ruin of him who does it?" Either interpretation may be made to suit the following clause; "to save life" (literally "a soul," but in the sense of anima, the living principle) may apply to the restoration of living energy, which would at once heal the withered limb; and "to kill" might mean to leave the quickening work undone; but the meaning seems at once more natural and more forcible as referring to the secret intention of the Pharisees, which, if not yet developed, was in spirit murderous, for "he who hateth his brother is a murderer." Cain-like in spirit, they like Cain felt the rebuke, but were not corrected by it.

5. *when he had looked round.*] This trait, specially characteristic of St. Mark, who uses the same word six times, is omitted by St. Matthew, but adopted by St. Luke. The anger elicited by the sullen silence of the Pharisees was blended with compassionate grief (συλλυπούμενος).

*hardness.*] Lit. "callosity," not precisely obduracy, but the dulness or apathy, the insensibility to good impressions which, if not

hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched *it* out: and his hand was restored whole as the other.

6 And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him.

7 But Jesus withdrew himself with his disciples to the sea: and a great multitude from Galilee followed him, and from Judæa,

---

corrected, ends in total deadness. This clause is peculiar to St. Mark.

*his hand was restored.*] See note at end of chapter.

*whole as the other.*] These words were probably inserted here from St. Matthew's Gospel. They are omitted in MSS of different recensions (sc. ℵ A B C, &c.).

6. *straightway took counsel with the Herodians.*] A most important crisis in our Lord's history. The Pharisees anticipate the final judgment of the Sanhedrim: they "condemned Him to be guilty of death," ch. xiv. 64. In fact they had two alternatives: either to accept His teaching, or to hold Him liable to the penalty for Sabbath-breaking. They leave the synagogue having fully made up their mind, yet feeling themselves powerless: no tribunal would have pronounced the sentence which they desired; the healing was effected not by an act, but by a word only; and even had the word been interpreted as equivalent to an act, it was a recognised principle that a prophet in cases like this was not bound by the ceremonial law. This is clearly stated by Maimonides, 'De Fundamentis Legis,' ch. ix. § 5-7; and 'Porta Mosis,' p. 17, ed. Pococke, where the Talmud is quoted to the same effect. It was therefore necessary to secure allies; and going much further than when they joined the disciples of John, ch. ii. 18, they applied to their natural enemies, a fact recorded by our evangelist only. Here we have the first notice of the Herodians, the avowed partisans of the secularists headed and represented by Herod: on ordinary occasions they were directly opposed to the Pharisees; but all minor differences would be sunk in face of a common foe upholding spiritual truth in opposition to worldliness on the one hand, and on the other to ceremonial formality.

We here reach the close of the second period in our Lord's public ministry: this leaves Him with a far wider sphere of influence, with claims more authoritatively declared, but in presence of bitter enemies bent upon destroying Him.

The time was probably soon after the feast of Pentecost. See Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' p. 197.

The third section, which begins here, extends to ch. vi. 13. It describes, on the one hand, a great advance in the organisation of the new community, on the other a further development of the relations between our Lord and the people.

7. *But Jesus withdrew, &c.*] This expression indicates for the first time an intention on our Lord's part to avoid premature hindrances to His ministry. From the word "to the sea," it is clear that the miracle just related took place at some distance in the interior of Galilee, certainly therefore not in Capernaum. It may possibly have been Sepphoris, at that time the chief city in Galilee, having lately been fortified by Herod Antipas, who made it his capital. There the Herodians would of course be numerous and influential, so too would the Pharisees, since one of the five Sanhedrims then existing in Palestine, met in that city—the other four were in Jerusalem, Gadara, Amathus, and Jericho. See Reland, 'Palæstina,' p. 100 ff.

*to the sea.*] The Sea of Galilee had among other advantages, that of easy communication with districts in which neither Pharisees nor Herodians possessed special influence.

*from Galilee.*] This expression is best explained by the fact that our Lord's journey had extended far into the interior of Galilee.

*and from Judæa.*] Before these words there should be a colon or a full stop. The whole clause may be rendered thus, "And from Judæa, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa, and (from the districts) beyond Jordan and about Tyre and Sidon a great multitude, hearing what things He did, came unto Him." The statement of St. Mark is, that in additicn to those who followed our Lord from the district which He had just quitted, a great multitude came from other quarters. If, with the A. V. and some commentators, we connected the verb "followed" with the names which come after it, the inference would be that a great crowd had come with Him on His return from Jerusalem after the Feast of Pentecost, which does not appear to have been the case on that, or indeed any other occasion. Whichever way we take it we have a strong corroboration of St. John's statements in ch. v., which indeed alone account satisfactorily for the fact: multitudes might naturally be

8 And from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa, and *from* beyond Jordan; and they about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, when they had heard what great things he did, came unto him.

9 And he spake to his disciples, that a small ship should wait on him because of the multitude, lest they should throng him.

10 For he had healed many; insomuch that they [1]pressed upon him for to touch him, as many as had plagues.

[1] Or, *rushed*.

11 And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God.

12 And he straitly charged them that they should not make him known.

13 [a]And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth *unto him* whom he would: and they came unto him.

[a] Matt. 10. 1.

14 And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach,

---

drawn to Galilee from Southern Palestine, Idumæa, and the Trans-Jordanic districts, if they had witnessed or heard of the transactions in Jerusalem; see too St. John vi. 1.

**8.** *about Tyre and Sidon.*] This is noted by St. Mark only. It confirms the account just given of the extent of our Lord's journey westward: Sepphoris is not far from the boundary of Phœnicia.

The scene of the transactions here related was undoubtedly some portion of the district of Gennesaret, near the sea, verse 7, on a level spot (Luke vi. 17), and close to the mountain, verse 13, where see note.

**10.** *For he had healed many.*] St. Mark thus gives the reason why the pressure was so great. Those who suffered from any kind of disease (literally, scourges; *i.e.* acute and painful attacks), seeing that He had healed others, came close (literally, fell upon Him) that they might touch Him, evidently in the hope that His touch would heal them (cf. ch. v. 28); St. Luke says in fact that "virtue went out of Him and healed all."

The order of events here differs somewhat in the synoptical Gospels; but it is evident that the account given by St. Mark is intended to prepare the mind for the call of the twelve, and that it occupies its right place in the narrative.

13-19. THE APPOINTMENT OF THE TWELVE.

**13.** *a mountain.*] **The mountain**: the definite article is used either as denoting a well-known site, or simply as distinguishing it from the plain. Many places on the basaltic terraces which surround the plain of Gennesaret, would satisfy the conditions of the narrative. Tristram describes one at no great distance from Ain Medawara (which he takes to be the site of Capernaum) remarkable as commanding the plain, where vast multitudes standing would be able to hear His voice. Tradition, however, fixes upon Mount Hattin as the place, of which full accounts are given by travellers.

From St. Luke vi. 12 we learn, that our Lord went up into the mountain in the evening, passing the night in earnest prayer, and that at daybreak He summoned all His disciples to Him, and from them selected twelve.

*whom he would.*] Insert **Himself**. St. Mark has two characteristic points. Our Lord calls those whom He Himself would—note the emphatic form, His will was the motive cause—and they came (literally, went away) to Him, their will consenting: the call His, theirs the responsive act.

The choice in the case of five at least, perhaps of seven, had been previously made, and some had doubtless (cf. i. 38) attended Him on His first missionary circuit: from this time all are found in constant exercise of ministerial functions.

**14.** *he ordained.*] The word is not that which was afterwards used to denote ordination: it means precisely "He made," which may be simply equivalent to appointed or instituted (see Heb. iii. 2, and 1 Kings xii. 6, LXX), but more probably has the special sense "created," *i.e.* called into existence, not merely as a new, but henceforth as a sacred body. This view is fully justified by the scriptural usage of ποιέω and the Hebrew *asah*.

The designation included two distinct duties: (1) these Disciples were to be with Him, as attendants and learners: (2) He would send them forth (ἀποστέλλω), an expression tantamount to that used by St. Matthew and St. Luke, "whom He named Apostles." When sent out they had two duties, to preach the Gospel and to cast out devils: special prominence is thus given to that power which modern thought finds

15 And to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils:

16 And Simon he surnamed Peter;

17 And James the *son* of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder:

18 And Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the *son* of Alphæus, and Thaddæus, and Simon the Canaanite,

---

most difficulty in accepting: but it is inseparable from the representation of the Evangelists, more especially of St. Mark: it exhibited in outward and striking form the specific work of the Christ, to destroy the work of the devil.

*to heal sicknesses.*] These words are omitted in the oldest MSS and late critical editions; but they are found in nine uncials and nearly all cursive MSS and in all ancient versions, excepting the Coptic.

16. *Simon he surnamed Peter.*] Before these words the oldest MSS insert "**and He appointed the twelve**," an emphatic iteration; but one not unlikely to have been passed over by copyists. It facilitates the construction, which is not easily explained when these words are omitted. St. Mark calls special attention to this formal, official confirmation of the name Peter, by which our Lord had previously declared that Simon should be called (cf. John i. 42, and see note on Matt. x. 2).

Justin Martyr refers to the statements of St. Mark in this and the next verse, in a passage of considerable importance in the dialogue with Trypho (§ 106, p. 201, A.). "He is said to have changed the name of one of the Apostles to Peter, and this is recorded in his memoirs (*i.e.* the memoirs of St. Peter), and to have surnamed two others, brothers, being sons of Zebedee, "sons of thunder." The reference to St. Mark is recognised by Ritschl, Köstlin, Meyer, Weiss, and strongly urged by Holtzmann. The expression "in his memoirs" is peculiar, best explained by Justin's own statement that "the memoirs which he quotes were composed by the Apostles themselves, and by those who followed them" (c. Tryph. § 103). When he quotes from St. Mark and St. Luke he has a formula somewhat different from that which he uses in quoting from the Gospels generally, or specially from St. Matthew and St. John. Here the term "his" points to St. Peter, held by all early writers to have been the virtual author of this Gospel: a point neglected by critics who adopt conjectural emendations (see Anger, Synopsis, p. 59). Compare the striking remarks by Sadler in 'The Lost Gospel,' section iv.

*Boanerges.*] This represents the Aramaic pronunciation of the Hebrew *Bene-ragesh*, sons of thunder. The thunder of eloquence, such as "shook the arsenal, and thundered over Greece," can scarcely be meant, there being no indication that the brothers were then or afterwards remarkable for that rare talent: but it is evident that the name was a title of honour, and could not therefore, as some assume, indicate serious faults of character. Fiery zeal bursting out on critical occasions characterises both brothers in the scriptural narrative; guided and informed by Divine grace it was the mainspring of their new life, pointing out the elder to Herod for slaughter as a prominent Christian leader (Acts xii. 2), and sustaining the younger to the end of his prolonged career. The Apocalypse affords most striking illustrations of that spirit and power in St. John, but it flashes out repeatedly in his other writings, and in his recorded acts.

18. *And Andrew.*] This belongs more properly to the preceding verse; the first four Apostles forming invariably a distinct group, with one deviation in order (see note on v. 16).

*Bartholomew.*] This is undoubtedly a patronymic — Bar Talmai, *i.e.*, son of Talmai. There are strong, if not conclusive, reasons for identifying him with Nathanael, John i. 45-51. See note on St. Matt. x. 3.

*Matthew.*] The Evangelist is here placed before Thomas, not after him, as in the first Gospel. The designation "publican" is also omitted. Both variations are accounted for naturally by the character of St. Matthew, who takes a lower place than that assigned to him by the other Evangelists, and records a fact which would be regarded as discreditable to him. The identity of Matthew with Levi ought not to be regarded as questionable.

*Thaddæus.*] Called also Lebbæus and Judas (see note on Matt. x. 3). St. Matthew and St. Mark agree in the order; St. Luke puts the name immediately before that of Judas Iscariot, probably to call attention to

19 And Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him: and they went [1]into an house.

[1] Or, *home*.

20 And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread.

21 And when his [1]friends heard *of it*, they went out to lay hold on

[1] Or, *kinsmen*.

---

their bearing the same name, which might cause some confusion (cf. John xiv 22). One manuscript, ancient, and critically important, but remarkable for interpolations (see Scrivener, intr. to Codex Bezæ) has Lebbæus: Origen (c. Cels. p. 176), notices this, or Lebes, as a false reading supported by a few MSS.

*Simon the Canaanite.*] Or, Simon Cananæus: cf. Matt. x. 4.

*betrayed him.*] St. Mark uses an expression which emphatically marks the act; St. Luke modifies it, "who also was or became, a betrayer."

There is undoubtedly at this point a considerable gap in St. Mark's narrative. The delivery of the Sermon on the Mount, if not in its entirety, yet certainly in its special application to the Disciples, immediately followed the call. That call was made at early dawn (see note on v. 13). There was therefore time and very sufficient reason for one or more addresses: a charge to the innermost circle of Disciples, and a more general discourse to the multitudes on the plain.

Again, St. Matthew gives an account of two miracles after the descent from the Mount, before our Lord's return to His usual residence at Capernaum, and from other notices it would appear that some time intervened. Omissions of acts frequently occurring on similar occasions are too common to justify charges of discrepancy: and, though we might be surprised at omissions of such extent at this critical juncture, we should observe that St. Mark is hastening onward to describe the feelings of the nearest relatives of our Lord at a period when He was taking a decisive step towards the organisation of His Church.

19-21. THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM; STATE OF FEELING AMONG THE PEOPLE, THE SCRIBES, AND THE MEMBERS OF OUR LORD'S FAMILY.

The arrangement of the text adopted in the A. V. is faulty. An entirely new paragraph, with a new series of events, begins with the words following.

**19.** *and they went into a house.*] Or, "**and he cometh home,**" according to the reading accepted by late critics, Tisch., Weiss, Sevin, and McClellan. This is preferable on internal grounds, the object of St. Mark being to point out the feelings manifested by the people and by our Lord's family on His return.

**20.** *the multitude cometh together again.*] As on the previous occasion (ch. ii. 1), when it was known that He was in the house where He usually resided at Capernaum, the multitude, that is the population of the city and adjoining district came thronging about the house: their zeal is described as importunate and even irksome, and is therefore supposed by some (Weiss, &c.) to be contrasted with the conduct of true disciples; but it would rather seem to be dwelt upon in reference to the very different feelings of our Lord's own connections.

**21.** *when his friends.*] The meaning is "those of His own household," with whom He had dwelt previously, up to the time when He entered upon his public ministry. The expression seems chosen to denote all members of the family, which probably consisted of the Virgin Mary, and of the children of Joseph, perhaps also of sons of the sister of Mary.

*they went out.*] This certainly implies that they came from another place, not merely from another house; they appear to have resided at Nazareth, ch. vi. 3: "when they heard" is an expression which implies that the report reached them from a distance. What they heard was that He had been followed by immense multitudes, among whom a number of demoniacs were conspicuous; that He had formally appointed a company of attendants; and that on His return he was surrounded by the whole population. To understand their feelings we must bear in mind the personal want of faith of His brethren, and their jealousy and indignation, attested by St. John (ch. vii. 3-9), in reference to this period (cf. Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' A.D. 30). They would also naturally inquire of those who came back from the Feast of Tabernacles, what impression had been made by Him at Jerusalem, where He had gone eschewing their company. He had there been rejected and persecuted by the Rulers, specially on the ground of His Galilean origin, and was regarded by many as a demoniac, cf. John vii. 20, 41, 48, 52; viii. 48, 52. Taking all these facts together they concluded that He was "beside Himself," in a state bordering on insanity. They knew too much of His life and character to fall in

him; for they said, He is beside himself.

22 ¶ And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, [b]He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out devils.

[b] Matt. 9. 34.

23 And he called them *unto him*, and said unto them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan?

24 And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand.

25 And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand.

26 And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end.

27 No man can enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house.

28 [c]Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme:

[c] Matt. 12. 31.

29 But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation:

30 Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.

31 ¶ [d]There came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him.

[d] Matt. 12. 46.

---

with the opinion that He was possessed by an unclean spirit; but mental alienation was a less uncharitable assumption, and seemed to call for their interference: they therefore came to "lay hold of Him," *i.e.* to put Him under restraint, and force Him to return to His old home. His mother could not share their feelings, but even she might think it right to go with them; the *sword was piercing through her own soul*, Luke ii. 35. She would not shrink from looking on her Son in the hour of His trial.

22-30. The Charge of Demoniacal Working.

The connexion with the preceding and following clauses is so obvious, that it is scarcely intelligible why some critics (*e.g.*, Weiss) should regard this section as misplaced. The "brothers" found their suspicions authoritatively confirmed on their arrival; nor should the climax be unnoticed; the people were excited, the relatives anxious, the scribes malignant.

**22.** *the scribes which came down from Jerusalem.*] The scribes came either moved by personal curiosity, or far more probably sent down formally by the Sanhedrim (so Weizsäcker), who would at that time be anxious to ascertain what was going on in Galilee, and to prevent the increase of our Lord's influence by notification of their own judgment touching His claims (see the passages from St. John's Gospel referred to in the previous note).

*He hath Beelzebub.*] This is said, not as a conjecture, but as a deliberate judgment. A most prominent characteristic of the public works of our Lord, as described by the Synoptists, and specially by St. Mark, has been shewn to be the expulsion of evil spirits. That was the first point to be met. No one questioned the fact of the expulsion: modern critics admit the fact of sudden and complete cures of insanity; they have their modes of accounting for it, fully stated by Keim, Hase, and writers of less sceptical character: the Scribes had their mode, one in which they may have themselves believed, which they had reason to think might tell upon the people: it fell in with, but went far beyond, the feelings of those who were most nearly related to our Lord. *He hath Beelzebub*, *i. e.* as a permanent inmate, and as "the strong one" (see v. 27), a source of preternatural power. This differs somewhat from ordinary possession, in which the evil inmate has the mastery, and gives no power. The following passage, so far as it goes, agrees with St. Matthew; but St. Mark omits all that does not bear upon his immediate object; it meets the charge: it disposes of the reasoning: it closes with the most awful warning, one which applies in its measure to all dishonest, and consciously untrue, imputations.

**29.** *is in danger of eternal damnation.*] Or, according to the reading now generally adopted, "is guilty of an eternal sin;" he commits a sin of which the effects and punishment belong to eternity.

31-35. The Arrival of our Lord's Family.

**31.** *and his mother, &c.*] Nearly a whole day must have intervened between their "going out" (v. 21) and their arrival. Our Saviour was now in the house teaching (Matt. xii. 46). The crowd assembled in the principal open room and in the forecourt was so dense that the brothers could not

32 And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee.

33 And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren?

34 And he looked round about on them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren!

35 For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and my mother.

---

make their way through it (Luke viii. 19); they remained therefore outside at the gate. The disciples sitting round Him (vv. 32, 34) call His attention to their presence and their wish to see Him; there is no allusion to their intention to put Him under restraint, of which of course no intimation had then been given.

**33.** *Who is my mother, or my brethren?*] See note on verse 35.

**34.** *And he looked round about.*] An expression frequently used by St. Mark on solemn occasions.

*on them which sat about Him.*] Literally, "**on those who were sitting about Him in a circle;**" the words denote the inner circle of His disciples, the Twelve of course, others, it may be, with them; but none save those whom He knew and trusted. The Scribes were near at hand. He had lately addressed them, but they did not now form part of the inner circle in the Presence Chamber of Messiah.

**35.** A profound, but trying, word: it brings out the great truth that spiritual relationship is deeper, more permanent and absolute than that which is merely natural; still, the very terms in which this judgment is expressed imply the intrinsic strength of the natural bond; to be as a mother, as a brother, is the highest privilege and dignity conferred upon true Disciples. The Mother was in the depth of her heart too truly a spiritual lover to be affected by the declaration, stern as it might sound.

In the brothers we see men of strong narrow feelings, genuine Jews, jealous as were the sons of Jacob, yet with a nature capable of nearer union; men in fact destined, when the final crisis came, to be counted among His sincere and loving followers: immediately after the Resurrection we read that the Disciples "continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brethren" (Acts i. 14; see also 1 Cor. ix. 5).

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on verse 5.

**5.** The word ἀπεκατεστάθη here used by all three Synoptists is remarkable for its abnormal form, with a double augment. It is regarded by Holtzmann and other critics as one of the strongest arguments in support of the hypothesis that the evangelists had a written document before them, it being unlikely that they should otherwise have all adopted an ungrammatical form; but the argument is scarcely conclusive, since the form, incorrect as it was, may have been commonly used in a provincial dialect: indeed it is not likely that St. Luke would have retained it had it not been generally accepted. See also note on ch. viii. 25.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *The parable of the sower,* 14 *and the meaning thereof.* 21 *We must communicate the light of our knowledge to others.* 26 *The parable of the seed growing secretly,* 30 *and of the mustard seed.* 35 *Christ stilleth the tempest on the sea.*

AND [a] he began again to teach by the sea side: and there was

[a] Matt. 13. 1.

---

**CHAP. IV.**] With this chapter begins a series of manifestations of our Lord: first, as the Teacher and Judge of Israel (iv. 1–34); and then as Lord over all: over inanimate nature (iv. 35–41); over the realm of darkness (v. 1–20); and over physical evils, over life and death (v. 21–43).

**1.** *And he began again to teach by the sea side.*] St. Mark thus draws out, more distinctly than the other Synoptists, a recommencement of public teaching. He alone notices the *return* to the seaside. Our Lord had withdrawn from the great crowds which attended His previous teaching (see ch. iii. 7, 9), and, after appointing the Twelve, He went back to Capernaum, where He continued His teaching, but to a smaller audience in

gathered unto him a great multitude, so that he entered into a ship, and sat in the sea; and the whole multitude was by the sea on the land.

2 And he taught them many things by parables, and said unto them in his doctrine,

3 Hearken; Behold, there went out a sower to sow:

4 And it came to pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way side, and the fowls of the air came and devoured it up.

5 And some fell on stony ground, where it had not much earth; and immediately it sprang up, because it had no depth of earth:

6 But when the sun was up, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away.

7 And some fell among thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit.

8 And other fell on good ground, and did yield fruit that sprang up and increased; and brought forth, some thirty, and some sixty, and some an hundred.

---

and about the house in which He habitually resided. He now comes forward again as a public Teacher, near the sea shore, a place specially adapted for addressing a vast multitude, supposed also by some (Volkmar) to be significant of the world-wide range of His teaching. On the time, see note on Matt. xii. 46.

*there was gathered . . . a great multitude.*] The assembling of so great a multitude—St. Mark uses a strong word, **very great**—seems to have occupied little time: they may, therefore, have been waiting in the neighbourhood of Capernaum. There are two slight differences in the reading of MSS; some of the oldest have, for '*great*,' *very great* (πλεῖστος), and for *was gathered*, *is gathered*, the historical present, used commonly by St. Mark in passing on to a new subject.

*into a ship.*] Or "the ship," as usual in St. Mark; but the reading is doubtful. It would imply that a ship was kept specially to meet such an emergency as now presented itself; cf. ch. iii. 9.

*sat in the sea.*] The expression is peculiar, literally, "in the sea," implying a separation from the people on the shore.

2. *And . . parables.*] This refers apparently to the mode of teaching, which from this time was generally adopted by our Lord in addressing mixed multitudes. It seems to have surprised His disciples. St. Mark in both clauses uses the imperfect tense, denoting continuance or repetition.

*in his doctrine.*] In the form of teaching now for the first time systematically introduced.

3–8. Parable of the Sower.

For the general exposition, see notes on St. Matthew.

3. *Hearken.*] This word is preserved by St. Mark alone. It is not, as some hold, superfluous, but prepares the way for the warning in verse 9. At the beginning all are called upon to listen; at the close the different classes of listeners are discriminated. St. Mark and St. Matthew then agree nearly verbatim up to the last clause of verse 7. St. Luke has some variations and additions, for which see notes *in loc.*

*a sower.*] **The sower.**

4. *of the air.*] Omitted by nearly all the best MSS: inserted probably from the first Gospel.

7. *choked.*] So St. Matthew; but St. Mark uses a word, slightly differing in form, which seems to indicate a choking simultaneous with the growth of the thorns. St. Luke notices this by a special word, *sprang up with.*

*it yielded no fruit.*] An addition, not unimportant. It marks a gradation. The first seed produced nothing; the second produced blades only; the third came near the point of bearing grain, but was then choked by the growth of thorns. The plain of Gennesaret might supply an illustration: it is now covered with prickly thorns and brambles.

8. *that sprang up and increased.*] These words, preserved by St. Mark alone, are emphatic: they mark the contrast, first with the seed which did not spring up at all, and then with that which yielded no produce.

The threefold produce noted by St. Matthew and St. Mark, but not by St. Luke, has been regarded as an addition; but it has here a fitting place, completing the parallelism of the parable. The difference between the two classes is radical: one produces no seed, the other produces good seed; but in each class there are three distinct degrees,

9 And he said unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

10 And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parable.

11 And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all *these* things are done in parables:

12 [f]That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and *their* sins should be forgiven them.

[f] Matt. 13. 14.

---

in the one of failure, in the other of success, the latter proportioned to the goodness of the soil and its state of preparedness.

9. *And he said.*] The word is emphatic. After delivering the parable He spake loudly; as St. Luke says, *He cried.*

*to hear.*] So too St. Luke. It is important. All have ears, but all have not ears doing their proper office. Some have no inward ear for God's harmonies.

10-13. APPLICATION OF THE DISCIPLES FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTION.

This section refers probably to a separate occasion. The inquiry was made when our Lord was alone: not, therefore, while the multitudes were still assembled, nor, as it would seem, in the small ship, which was scarcely adapted for a discourse addressed not to the Twelve only, but to other disciples. This, however, was the most suitable place for recording it; the reader is at once informed why the mode of teaching was changed. See note on St. Matthew xiii. 10.

10. *they that were about him.*] St. Mark alone notices the presence of other disciples with the Twelve: this is a point of considerable importance. All who were willing to be taught received instruction. Cf. ch. xvi. 10. So Hilgenf. 'Einl.' pp. 515, 562.

*the parable.*] This is the common reading; but the oldest MSS and versions, and late critical editions have **the parables**. One parable alone has yet been recorded, and the explanation of one only is given here by St. Luke; but the inquiry, and our Lord's answer to it, were general.

11. *Unto you.*] To you who thus inquire, seeking to know the truth. That is the criterion. All who ask receive, and according to what they ask; the disciples ask what is the inner meaning.

*to know the mystery.*] The oldest MSS omit "to know," which was probably inserted from St. Matthew. "Mystery," a word which in the Gospels occurs only here and in the corresponding passages, is taken in the full sense—a truth unknown previously, but now revealed to disciples. This statement recognises in the disciples a distinct advance in spiritual intelligence.

*that are without.*] This striking expression is preserved here by St. Mark only; "without," out of the spiritual sphere, not seeking spiritual truth.

*all these things are done.*] *I. e.* all the things which pertain to the kingdom of God are presented under the form of parables: those only who recognise the spirituality of Christ's kingdom can discern the inner meaning of His teaching or of the events. Parables arrest attention, are easily remembered, and supply materials for future meditation: but they produce no spiritual effect until the spiritual sense is awakened: cf. 1 Cor. ii. 14.

12. *That seeing they may see, &c.*] This refers not to the intention of the Speaker, whose object is to sow the word, but to the state of the hearers who are 'without.' Their state of alienation—whatever may be its cause, whether spiritual deadness or moral obliquity—does not prevent them from seeing the outward indications of Christ's presence, but it makes them incapable of discerning the inner meaning. All are called upon to hear and to inquire; but the influences at work upon those who are 'without' keep them aloof, excluding not only the right understanding of interesting parables or of significant events, but the saving grace, of which the spoken word and outward act are intended to be sacramental channels. The word rendered *perceive* admirably expresses the state of a mind and heart "following on to know the Lord." St. Mark has in his mind the passage of Isaiah, which is quoted from the Septuagint by St. Matthew, and he gives the general meaning in a concise and impressive form. See note on St. Matt. xiii. 14. A striking exposition is proposed by H. Lutteroth, 'Essai d'Interprétation de Saint Matthieu,' pp. 207–209:—"It is not to be supposed that the parables, obscure as they may have been sometimes even for the most clearsighted, were intended to hide the truths which they contained. They hid them only from those who, far from asking their master, like the disciples, for an explanation, wilfully did all they could to disable themselves from knowing the meaning."

13 And he said unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how then will ye know all parables?

14 ¶ The sower soweth the word.

15 And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; but when they have heard, Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts.

16 And these are they likewise which are sown on stony ground; who, when they have heard the word, immediately receive it with gladness;

17 And have no root in themselves, and so endure but for a time: afterward, when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately they are offended.

18 And these are they which are sown among thorns; such as hear the word,

19 And the cares of this world, [a]and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful.

20 And these are they which are sown on good ground; such as hear the word, and receive *it*, and bring forth fruit, some thirtyfold, some sixty, and some an hundred.

21 ¶ [b]And he said unto them, Is a candle brought to be put under a

[a] 1 Tim. 6. 17.

[b] Matt. 5. 15.

---

13. *Know ye not this parable?*] From the general observation our Lord passes to the explanation of the first parable. The second clause is rightly explained by Fritzsche, "how then will ye understand all parables, as it behoveth those to do who are initiated in the mystery of the Messianic kingdom?" The words, preserved by St. Mark only, express blame as well as surprise at their slowness of comprehension. This throws a vivid light upon their actual state of mind at the time—anxious to learn, but with spiritual instinct imperfectly developed.

14-20. EXPOSITION OF THE FIRST PARABLE.

14. *the word.*] St. Matthew explains, "the word of the kingdom;" *i. e.* not simply the word of moral truth, but spiritual truth concerning the kingdom of heaven.

15. *in their hearts.*] So St. Matthew. Here some old MSS have "in them:" others, still more forcibly, "upon them," as though it fell upon their hearts but was not fully received.

16. *likewise.*] *I. e.* according to the same mode of interpretation; not as some (De Wette) explain it, referring to the hardness common to the wayside and the rocky ground.

18. *And these are they.*] Rather, according to another reading, **And others there are**; this marks a considerable difference.

*thorns.*] Or "the thorns."

19. *the cares of this world.*] Anxious thoughts about worldly matters (cf. Matt. vii. 31). For "this world" old MSS have "the cares of the world," equivalent to the cares of common life.

*and the lusts of other things.*] An emphatic addition, completing the threefold forms of temptation. St. Luke has "pleasures of life" (cf. 1 Peter ii. 11).

20. *And these are they.*] Or, *and* **those** *are they:* **those** points to an entirely distinct class.

*are sown.*] Or, **have been sown.** St. Mark uses a different form here and in vv. 16, 18; this seems to imply complete or effectual action.

*and receive it.*] The word implies welcome reception. St. Luke has "keep *i.e.* retain it."

Ewald has striking remarks upon the force and beauty of this account of our Lord's exposition: so lively, rich in meaning, and so characteristic.

21-25. PROVERBIAL SAYINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE EXPOSITION.

21. *And he said.*] Probably at the same time; but St. Mark may have introduced these sayings as bearing generally upon the spirit in which the disciples are to receive and use such teaching. St. Luke, however, keeps the same order, ch. viii. 16, 18.

The object of the first saying is to impress upon the disciples their duty; they must explain to others what is become clear to themselves.

*Is a candle brought.*] Literally, **does the candle** (or lamp) **come?** The lamp here is the light of truth, which comes in the person of Christ; is not brought by Him that it should be hidden. All His parables are intended to be understood; the disciples who understand them must teach others, must hold up the light that others may see it. This saying is recorded by St. Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount (ch. v. 15); here it has a direct practical application.

[l] bushel, or under a bed? and not to be set on a candlestick?

[l] The word in the original signifieth a less measure, as Matt. 5. 15.

22 [c] For there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad.

[c] Matt. 10. 26.

23 If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.

24 And he said unto them, Take heed what ye hear: [d] with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you: and unto you that hear shall more be given.

[d] Matt. 7. 2.

25 [e] For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath.

[e] Matt. 13. 12.

26 ¶ And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground;

27 And should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how.

28 For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.

29 But when the fruit is [l] brought forth, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come.

[l] Or, *ripe*.

---

*under a bushel.*] **Under the bushel**: the flour-box, or measure, containing about six pints, one-sixth of the Attic medimnus, or bushel, sufficient for a few days' consumption in a small family. The description applies to the common houses of the people. In each there was one principal room, in which they ate and slept; the lampstand, with its single light, the flour-bin, and the bed, with a few seats, were all its furniture.

*and not to be set.*] Or, **is it not that it may be set on the candlestick**, or lampstand? Is not that the purpose for which it comes?

**22.** *For . . . manifested.*] Rather, **for there is nothing hidden but in order that it may be manifested.** The parable is not spoken but with the intention that its hidden meaning should be manifested to those who seek for light. The readings vary; that of the oldest MSS seems preferable, and is here followed: the same meaning is suggested by other readings.

*neither was . . . kept secret.*] Or, **neither was it concealed** (enveloped in the obscure form of parable) **but** (with the intention) **that it should come to light.** The second clause thus applies a general proposition to the case now before the disciples' mind.

**24.** *Take heed, &c.*] A striking application of sayings previously uttered (cf. Matt. vii. 2, vi. 33; Luke vi. 38, xii. 31, xix. 26). The disciples must look attentively at what is set before them, both as to its import and as to the duty which it imposes. If they measure it correctly and distribute it freely, they will receive a corresponding reward; nay, far more shall be given. The words "that hear," omitted by the oldest MSS, appear to be a gloss, rather weakening the force of the monition: the reward will be not for those who hear, but for those who use what they receive for the benefit of others.

26–29. PARABLE OF SECRET GROWTH.

This parable is peculiar to St. Mark. Weiss regards it as parallel to Matt. xiii. 24-30, but the points of resemblance are secondary, those of difference are substantial. It describes the progress of the kingdom between its establishment and its completion.

**26.** *should cast seed.*] Or **the seed**, that which he has to sow; or it may be, with reference to the preceding parable, the seed already described, the seminal principle of the kingdom.

**27.** *And should sleep, and rise.*] The sower is thus represented as leaving the corn-field, not without careful tending but, without further sowing. In the meantime a secret process goes on underground, without his consciousness or help. The sower seems, therefore, here to represent the human preacher of the Gospel, to whom the Lord commits His word. The vitality of the seed is independent of the ministerial act. The earth, on the other hand, is represented as self-acting: it develops the seed by natural processes, including all influences by which it is regularly affected—sunshine, breeze, and shower—thus representing the heart under the influences of grace.

**29.** *when the fruit is brought forth.*] Or **when the fruit admits**, or offers itself, *i. e.* when being ripe it is fit for the reaper, and allows his work (so Meyer, Grimm, and Weiss).

*he putteth in the sickle.*] Or, **he sendeth forth** the sickle. This reaping represents the season of reward rather than of judgment; the wheat will be gathered into the garner.

The parable refers primarily to the Church

30 ¶ And he said, *f* Whereunto shall we liken the kingdom of God? or with what comparison shall we compare it?

*f* Matt. 13. 31.

31 *It is* like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth:

32 But when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it.

33 *g* And with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear *it*.

*g* Matt. 13. 34.

34 But without a parable spake he not unto them: and when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples.

35 *h* And the same day, when the even was come, he saith unto them,

*h* Matt. 8. 23.

---

as a whole. Its duration will be commensurate with its work; when that is complete, the end will come.

30-32. PARABLE OF THE GRAIN OF MUSTARD.

**30.** *with what comparison shall we compare it?*] Literally, in what parable should we place it? *i. e.* under what figure should we represent it? The word "we" implies deliberation. as though our Lord would invite His disciples to consider with Him under what form the Church can be most completely represented.

**32.** *it groweth up, &c.*] The description of the process of growth is fuller than in the other Gospels. It begins after the sowing, thus connecting the figure with that in the preceding parable; then it notices the coming up, the gradual attainment to a size exceeding all herbs, and the shooting out great branches —a vivid and accurate description; the branches of the mustard-plant are used for fuel in Spain (see Maldonatus, quoted in note on Matt. xiii. 31). The word "tree" is not used by St. Mark, but is found in the two other Synoptists.

*under the shadow of it.*] St. Matthew and St. Luke have "in its branches." The expression here seems more accurate; but in the other Evangelists "in the branches" may mean "protected by the branches."

33-34. PUBLIC TEACHING AND PRIVATE EXPOSITION.

**33.** *as they were able to hear.*] The parables were, therefore, not delivered in immediate succession; an interval was allowed between them for reflection. That interval brought out the difference between different classes of hearers: those who were simply curious filled their minds with striking figures, those who were in earnest prepared themselves for further inquiry.

**34.** This verse repeats what has been already considered (v. 10 ff.). The expressions are very striking. *Without a parable*, or "except in parable," He did not speak to them, *i. e.* the mixed multitude; the second clause comes out more distinctly if we adopt the reading of the oldest MSS and render it thus: "but privately to His own disciples He expounded all things." The words rendered in the A.V. "when they were alone," and "to his disciples," lit., to His own, correspond exactly in the original (κατ' ἰδίαν . . . τοῖς ἰδίοις); they were His own because they were separated from the crowd in their search for truth. The word rendered "expounded" (ἐπέλυεν) has a twofold interest:—(1) It occurs nowhere else in the Gospels, and is quoted in the Clementine Homilies, xix. 20 (see Westcott, Hist. of the Canon, ed. v. p. 283, note 3); and (2) it supplies St. Peter with the word for the interpretation of prophecy (see 2 Peter i. 20). Under both points of view it has important bearings upon the Canon of Scripture in reference to the genuineness of this Gospel and of the second epistle of St. Peter. It is used frequently in the 'Shepherd of Hermas,' a work which belongs to what is called the Petrine school.

35-41. THE FIRST SEA VOYAGE AND THE GREAT STORM.

The great day of teaching was followed by a night and day of miracles, each showing forth some special attribute of our Lord's Personality. They differ partly in kind, partly in degree, from previous manifestations of power. The first reveals Him as Lord of nature, the second as Lord of spirits, the third as Healer of deadly disease, the fourth as Lord and Restorer of life. The second miracle is further remarkable as giving occasion to the first formal rejection of His ministrations.

**35.** *And the same day.*] Literally, "on that day"; the day on which the parables were delivered. This implies that those at least which are recorded by St. Mark were delivered in the course of one day, though the exposition may have been given afterwards.

Let us pass over unto the other side.

36 And when they had sent away the multitude, they took him even as he was in the ship. And there were also with him other little ships.

37 And there arose a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the ship, so that it was now full.

38 And he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow: and they awake him, and say unto him, Master, carest thou not that we perish?

39 And he arose, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm.

40 And he said unto them, Why are ye so fearful? how is it that ye have no faith?

41 And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, What manner of man is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?

---

*Let us pass over.*] According to some writers (see Farrar), the main object of this departure was repose; as though, wearied by a long day's teaching, He would be alone. This, however, is not intimated in the Gospels. The usual course of our Lord, after giving full instruction in one place, was to go elsewhere, not to rest, but to teach others (see ch. i. 38). He now passes over to the opposite shore, that is, to a district of the Decapolis, a stronghold of heathenism, where His preaching was specially needed, and repose would be out of the question.

St. Matthew has here a very interesting notice of the way in which our Lord dealt with applicants for admission among His personal followers; this is omitted by St. Mark hastening on to the next crisis.

*other little ships.*] Or simply, "other ships;" so the oldest MSS and Versions. Though the great mass of the people were dismissed, many followed Him across the lake, either having their own boats at hand or hiring some for the occasion. This accords with other notices of followers not counted among the Twelve (see note on verse 10).

37. *there arose.*] Literally, "there arises;" the historical present, commonly used by St. Mark.

*a great storm.*] The Greek word denotes a sudden and violent gust of wind, such as frequently bursts on the lake, which is surrounded by mountains with deep ravines.

*beat into the ship.*] Or, "**were beating into the ship, so that the ship was now being filled;**" as St. Matthew says, "covered with the waves."

38. *a pillow.*] Rather, "the pillow." The best illustration of this passage is supplied by Van-Lennep, 'Bible Lands,' p. 62:—"At the extreme end of the stern is often seen a small low bench, upon which the steersman sometimes sits for a change. Here the captain often rests his head when, as is his custom, he sleeps on the quarter-deck. This little bench may generally be seen on the fishing-crafts, particularly those which ply on the Sea of Galilee (see Macgregor, 'Rob Roy on the Jordan,' p. 358): a circumstance which explains the nature of the pillow on which rested the head of our Lord during the sudden storm. Passengers of distinction alone are allowed a place on the quarter-deck."

*carest thou not.*] This expression, if not bordering on irreverence, yet certainly indicating impatience, is characteristically recorded by St. Mark. St. Peter—probably, as usual, the spokesman—would not forget his own words, or the over-hasty temper which they indicated.

39. *And he arose.*] Or, **and He was awakened.** There is here a slight difference in the order of the narrative. St. Matthew gives first the word of rebuke; St. Mark and St. Luke the word of command. This seems more accurate: the rebuke would tell with greater force after the deliverance.

Dr. Farrar dwells upon the picturesque accessories of this miracle. Its true importance is that it marks a new disclosure of Divine power. After the disciples have been instructed in the mysteries of the kingdom, they are witnesses of the power of the King.

41. *What manner of man is this?*] Rather, **who then is this?** The word "man" weakens the expression. After the first miracle at Capernaum, the question was, "what thing is this?" (ch. i. 27); attention was then directed to the act: now "who is this?" attention is fastened upon the Person, gradually making Himself felt in His fulness.

## CHAPTER V.

1 *Christ delivering the possessed of the legion of devils,* 13 *they enter into the swine.* 25 *He healeth the woman of the bloody issue,* 35 *and raiseth from death Jairus his daughter.*

AND [i] they came over unto the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gadarenes.

[i] Matt. 8. 28.

2 And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit,

3 Who had *his* dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with chains:

4 Because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any *man* tame him.

5 And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones.

6 But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him,

---

CHAP. V.—1-20. THE DEMONIAC AT GERASA.

1. *the country of the Gadarenes.*] So St. Matthew viii. 28, where see note. There the true reading is probably "Gerasenes," the people of Gerasa. (So ℵ B D, and most late editors.) This was formerly rejected, because the only Gerasa then known was situate far from the sea, on the borders of Arabia Petræa. The happy discovery of Dr. Thomson (see 'The Land and the Book,' ii. § 25), now generally accepted (Weiss, Volkmar, Tristram, Farrar), appears to settle the question. The ruins of a city, not large, but with considerable suburbs, called Kersa, or Gersa, are found close to the sea, opposite to Capernaum:—"Directly above it is an immense mountain, in which are ancient tombs. The lake is so near the base of the mountain that the swine rushing madly down could not stop, but would be hurried on into the water and be drowned." Again: "Take your stand a little to the south of this Chersa. A great herd of swine, we will suppose, is feeding on this mountain. They are seized with a sudden panic, rush madly down the almost perpendicular declivity—those behind tumbling over and thrusting forward those before; and as there is neither time nor space to recover on the narrow shelf between the base and the lake, they are crowded headlong into the water and perish." Dr. Tristram corroborates this account of the steepness of the bluff behind and of the narrowness of the shore, and observes, "the statement of Origen exactly bears out the discovery of Dr. Thomson. After observing that Gadara was not the scene of the miracle, for there was no steep place there near the sea, he states that Gergesa (Gerasa) is an ancient city on the shore of the lake, by which there is a steep place that runs down into it" (Tristram, 'Land of Israel,' pp. 465, 466). Dr. Farrar agrees with this, and adds that, in the days of Eusebius and Jerome, a steep declivity near Gergesa (or Gerasa) was pointed out as the seat of the miracle. He holds also that Γεργεσηνῶν was probably no mere conjecture of Origen, but the true reading in St. Matthew. Gadara may have been the better known name of the district (see 'Life of Christ,' i. 333).

2. *out of the tombs.*] See Dr. Thomson's account in the preceding note. St. Luke, less accurately, has "out of the city." St. Matthew mentions two demoniacs. See note on Matt. viii. 28.

3. *Who had his dwelling.*] A point suggested, but not stated, by St. Matthew. It implies habitual residence, and long absence from the homes of the living. Evil or unclean spirits are generally represented as haunting waste desolate places and tombs. They carry away those whom they possess to their own haunts—a point noted by Keim. Volkmar regards this miracle as symbolical of the state of heathenism; see note on v. 9.

*and no man could bind him.*] The best MSS and late editors, add "**any longer.**"

4. *neither could any man tame him.*] Rather, **and no one was strong enough to subdue him.**

The facts related in this verse are passed over in the succinct account of St. Matthew, who, however, notices one point omitted by St. Mark and St. Luke—"no one could pass by that way." The graphic details in verse 5, each characteristic of frenzy, are peculiar to St. Mark. The symptoms of active mania are found in all accounts of demoniacs—a point fully recognised by those critics who accept the Gospels in their literal sense. The hatred of man, the hatred of self, are spiritual affections, which physical science notes and deals with chiefly by moral influence, but which it does not profess to explain.

6. *he ran.*] St. Mark reverts to the first part of his narrative. He has told us that

7 And cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, *thou* Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not.

8 For he said unto him, Come out of the man, *thou* unclean spirit.

9 And he asked him, What *is* thy name? And he answered, saying, My name *is* Legion: for we are many.

10 And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country.

11 Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding.

12 And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them.

13 And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand;) and were choked in the sea.

14 And they that fed the swine fled, and told *it* in the city, and in the country. And they went out to see what it was that was done.

15 And they come to Jesus, and see him that was possessed with the devil, and had the legion, sitting, and clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid.

---

our Lord was met by the demoniac when He came to land: he now accounts for that fact. While raging on the mountain, the man had seen Jesus afar off, and ran down to meet Him. St. Luke omits this point and compresses the narrative, which gains much in clearness by our Evangelist's account.

**7.** *I adjure thee by God.*] This word might seem to come from the man, recoiling instinctively from the pangs of convulsive struggles; but, as the next clause shews, it is the unclean spirit which speaks, in dread of torture after expulsion. St. Matthew has "us" twice, but he speaks of two demoniacs.

**8.** *For he said.*] Not, as some commentators take it, "had said," but "was saying," *i. e.* was on the point of saying; the adjuration of the demoniac anticipated the utterance of the word of power.

**9.** *And he asked him.*] Literally, "was asking him." Our Lord went on asking; thus, it may be, acting upon the man's consciousness.

*Legion.*] A host, so to speak, of evil powers. A collective noun is used, denoting united action. The possession by a multitude of evil spirits has other examples, cf. ch. xvi. 9, and our Lord's saying, Matt. xii. 45. Weiss explains the word less satisfactorily: "We are many, says the demoniac, since the fearful power with which the demoniac force overmasters him is realised by him as though a whole host of demons had taken up their abode in him." Volkmar suggests that the occupation of the entire district by false gods is symbolised.

**10.** *And he besought him.*] The demoniac, speaking as the prophet (μάντις) of the indwelling spirits, besought Him not to send them out of the country; it was a heathenish district; they would remain there at any cost, and they have their wish. See note on ch. xvi. 17.

**11-13.** These verses correspond nearly verbatim with St. Matthew and St. Luke. Observe, however, the accurate notice of St. Mark "on the mountain," which, as we have seen, was close to the sea; the swine feeding on the higher tract would, as St. Matthew remarks, be at a considerable distance.

**12.** *that we may enter into them.*] This evidently means that the unclean spirits sought a new home in the unclean beasts, which, however, recoil from the contact. We know nothing of the relations between impure spirits and the natures — whether rational, spiritual, or merely animal—with which they may be brought into contact, to which in their utter degradation they may have a certain affinity.

**13.** *a steep place.*] Or, **the steep**; see note on v. 1.

*about two thousand.*] Immense herds of swine were kept in many provinces of the Roman empire specially for the provisionment of the army (see the striking account in Polybius, ii. 15, xii. 4, 11). A heavy loss was certainly recognised by the people of the city.

**14.** *and in the country.*] St. Matthew speaks only of the city; the swineherds would naturally be dispersed in all directions.

**15.** *sitting.*] As St. Luke notices, at the feet of Jesus. The exceeding beauty of this picture, contrasted with the preceding hor-

16 And they that saw *it* told them how it befell to him that was possessed with the devil, and *also* concerning the swine.

17 And they began to pray him to depart out of their coasts.

18 And when he was come into the ship, he that had been possessed with the devil prayed him that he might be with him.

19 Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee.

20 And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all *men* did marvel.

21 And when Jesus was passed over again by ship unto the other side, much people gathered unto him: and he was nigh unto the sea.

22 [k] And, behold, there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; and when he saw him, he fell at his feet,

[k] Matt. 9. 18.

23 And besought him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death: *I pray thee*, come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be healed; and she shall live.

24 And *Jesus* went with him; and much people followed him, and thronged him.

25 And a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years,

---

rors, strikes every reader; but the effect upon the people of the district was simply terror.

**16.** *and concerning the swine.*] A notable climax. The people who had witnessed the transactions tell the citizens what had been done for the demoniac and about the swine —*their* swine; that settled their minds. Then they began, as St. Mark says, to entreat Him to depart from their district. Such was the effect of our Lord's first contact with heathenism.

**18–20.** This touching account, retained with slight verbal changes by St. Luke, is of great importance as regards the immediate result and the general bearings. The man obtained his wish, but not in his own way. He would be a personal follower of Jesus, like the three who had applied to our Lord just before this (see Matt. viii. 19–22). Like them he had an answer not at once meeting his desire, but spiritually he gained all: he became a missionary to his own people, the first apostle, so to speak, to the Gentiles, a type of St. Paul. The Cross was thus planted in the district, which our Lord seems to have revisited towards the close of His ministry in Galilee. (See notes on ch. vii. 31, and on ch. viii. 10.)

21–43. THE TWO MIRACLES AT CAPERNAUM.

**21.** After this verse St. Matthew inserts an account of circumstances which have been previously recorded by St. Mark. On the order of time, see notes on St. Matthew and the general harmony.

*by ship.*] Rather, **in the ship.** The passage back in the same ship brings us again to the shore of the plain of Gennesaret, near Capernaum. There was a great multitude, as St. Luke says, anxiously awaiting Him. This may have been early in the afternoon. Our Lord had crossed to the opposite coast late in the evening; at what hour He arrived there is uncertain, probably at daybreak. All that was done there might occupy a few hours.

**22.** *one of the rulers of the synagogue.*] Thus too St. Luke; St. Matthew has simply "a certain ruler."

*Jairus by name.*] The name Jaïr occurs in the Pentateuch (Numb. xxxii. 41.). It is singularly adapted to the circumstances, meaning "He will awake;" but coincidences of this kind are common in Holy Scripture, and, as Weiss shews, do not excuse the suspicions of such critics as Strauss and Volkmar. The meaning of the name would certainly not occur to St. Mark's readers; had it been present to his own mind, he would probably have added an interpretation.

**23.** *lieth at the point of death.*] This expresses the sense of the Greek, which, as is commonly the case in St. Mark, corresponds very nearly to the Latin idiom, "in extremis est"—is in extremity. St. Luke adds, "she lay a-dying." St. Matthew has, "is just dead," or "died just now." The confused utterances of the father, now stating what he knew—"she is all but dead," now saying what he believed to be the fact—"she is already gone," are too true to nature to need defence.

**24.** *and thronged him.*] Actual, and even

26 And had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse,

27 When she had heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched his garment.

28 For she said, If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole.

29 And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in *her* body that she was healed of that plague.

30 And Jesus, immediately knowing in himself that virtue had gone out of him, turned him about in the press, and said, Who touched my clothes?

31 And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?

32 And he looked round about to see her that had done this thing.

33 But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth.

34 And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague.

35 While he yet spake, there came from the ruler of the synagogue's *house certain* which said, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Master any further?

36 As soon as Jesus heard the

---

rude, pressure is implied, and is well expressed by the word "thronged."

**26.** This verse, substantially agreeing with St. Luke, adds several points to St. Matthew's account, such as the incurable character of the disease, and the poverty to which the sufferer was reduced. The treatment of diseases at that time, not among the Jews only, but throughout the East, was exceedingly trying; painful and loathsome remedies were commonly employed, and the expense was generally very heavy in such cases as this. (See Lightfoot, 'Exercitations upon St. Mark.')

**28.** *I shall be whole.*] Literally, I shall be saved, *i.e.* made whole.

It was natural that expositors of Holy Scripture should see in this woman a type of the Jewish Church, bleeding to death, and tortured by superstitious, inefficacious, tedious, and costly treatment.

**29.** The immediate effect was the drying up of the source of her malady. This she felt inwardly, a sensation assuring her that the cure was complete. St. Mark gives details, such as St. Peter must have dwelt upon frequently, both for their significance and their resemblance to miraculous works wrought afterwards by himself in the name of Jesus. Cf. Acts iii. 6, 7; v. 15; ix. 34, 38.

**30.** *And Jesus . . . gone out of him.*] Or, "**And immediately Jesus, having perceived in himself** (or recognised inwardly) **that the virtue** (literally, the power) **had gone forth from Him.**" This statement, taken from our Lord's own word (Luke viii. 46), throws some light on the nature of the miraculous effluence from the Person of our Saviour. It was physical in its operation—the woman felt the result in her body—but spiritual in its source and condition. Our Lord recognised the fact that the indwelling virtue had been drawn forth by an act of faith.

**31.** *And his disciples.*] St. Luke notices that St. Peter was, as usual, the spokesman. The question was natural, but interesting as proving that no mere bodily sensation called the attention of Jesus to what was done.

**32.** *And he looked round about.*] See note on ch. iii. 5.

**33.** *But the woman.*] Each word indicates the inward struggle of the woman. She knew that what had been done in her was a result of her own act, without permission from Jesus, and she could scarcely hope that the faith which suggested it would be accepted as genuine; hence the terror and trembling, the sudden prostration, and the full confession.

**34.** *and be whole.*] A different word from that used in v. 28, giving an assurance of restoration to perfect health, such as was still needed by the woman. This is recorded expressly by St. Mark alone, but it is implied by other words of our Lord in St. Matthew and St. Luke.

The narrative in St. Matthew is probably an abbreviated form of the apostolical tradition. St. Luke is fuller, agreeing substantially with St. Mark, who seems to have added several details, which bear marks of his style—some, it may be, explanatory, but chiefly such as he would learn from St. Peter, a keen observer, and specially fond of dwelling upon indications of his Master's tenderness.

**36.** *As soon as Jesus heard.*] The word, as given in a few MSS, means "overheard,"

word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid, only believe.

37 And he suffered no man to follow him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James.

38 And he cometh to the house of the ruler of the synagogue, and seeth the tumult, and them that wept and wailed greatly.

39 And when he was come in, he saith unto them, Why make ye this ado, and weep? the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth.

40 And they laughed him to scorn. But when he had put them all out, he taketh the father and the mother of the damsel, and them that were with him, and entereth in where the damsel was lying.

41 And he took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise.

42 And straightway the damsel arose, and walked; for she was *of the age* of twelve years. And they were astonished with a great astonishment.

43 And he charged them straitly that no man should know it; and commanded that something should be given her to eat.

## CHAPTER VI.

1 *Christ is contemned of his countrymen.* 7 *He giveth the twelve power over unclean spirits.* 14 *Divers opinions of Christ.* 27 *John Baptist is beheaded,* 29 *and buried.* 30 *The apostles return from preaching.* 34 *The miracle of five loaves and two fishes.* 48 *Christ walketh on the sea:* 53 *and healeth all that touch him.*

AND [a] he went out from thence, and came into his own country; and his disciples follow him.

[a] Matt 13. 54.

---

heard, as it were, by accident, words not spoken to him. Another rendering is proposed, sc., *not heeding;* so Grimm, *s. v.*

37. *And he suffered, &c.*] This statement is omitted by St. Matthew; St. Luke retains it, and it undoubtedly belonged to the original account. The selection of the three disciples is distinctly marked on critical occasions; this was the first great presage of the Resurrection. Meyer says that St. Luke differs here from St. Mark, representing the separation of the three to have been made within the house. This is not correct. St. Luke says, that he did not allow any but them and the parents to enter the house.

38. *the tumult.*] Or, "a tumult, and people weeping and wailing greatly."

39. *this ado.*] Or, "tumult," as in *v.* 38.

40. *put them all out.*] The expulsion of the crowd is noticed by the three Synoptists; the admission of the parents is recorded by St. Luke, but more accurately here by St. Mark, who relates it as having occurred after the entrance into the house. The mother, of course, was within, though not then in the chamber where the dead child lay.

41. *Talitha cumi.*] St. Mark thus preserves the original form of our Lord's command in the vernacular language of Palestine. *Cumi,* not *cum,* which Tischendorf gives, is the true and grammatical reading. This word of power must have been present to St. Peter's mind when he said over the body of Dorcas, "Tabitha, arise!" Acts ix. 40.

*Damsel.*] St. Mark has the diminutive, expressing tenderness, 'little maiden.'

42. *astonished with a great astonishment.*] St. Mark dwells emphatically upon the astonishment felt by the parents (see St. Luke), but shared doubtless by the three apostles. It was the first miracle which manifested their Master as Lord over death and life, the first which prepared their minds for the Resurrection.

43. *he charged them.*] The parents and the three disciples, specially the former. The reason for the prohibition was doubtless to avoid a notoriety, which might excite the people and give occasion for tumultuary proceedings. The disciples would, of course, obey; but the parents could scarcely conceal their feelings of gratitude. It is observable that such prohibitions are confined to occasions on which miracles were wrought privately, and that no similar prohibition was ever given in reference to our Lord's teaching (Meyer). The private instruction which He gave to His disciples was intended to make them Teachers of the people. See notes on ch. iv. 21, 22.

### CHAP. VI.—1-6. THE VISIT TO NAZARETH.

The account here given of the visit to Nazareth agrees substantially with St. Matthew's, both as to time and circumstances; but it adds several points, which enable us better to understand the objects and effects.

2 And when the sabbath day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing *him* were astonished, saying, From whence hath this *man* these things? and what wisdom *is* this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands?

3 Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and

---

It resembles the account which St. Luke gives (ch. iv. 16 ff.) of the first preaching at Nazareth, so closely indeed that some critics (Weiss, Holtzmann, Volkmar) hold that both Evangelists refer to the same event, and that St. Luke anticipates the real time. But it is admitted by other critics that a second visit is not in itself improbable, and there are good reasons for accepting both accounts. It was quite natural that the first persons whom our Lord addressed on His return to Galilee, after John's imprisonment, should be His own townsmen; and also that after their rejection of Him He should remain a considerable time engaged in missionary work before He revisited them. The works wrought in the interval, the effects of His personal influence, the progress made in spite of all opposition, might be expected to work upon the minds of the Nazarenes so far as to prepare them for listening to Him, notwithstanding their former rejection. Natural sympathy would draw Him thither. His sisters, probably married to Nazarenes, still dwelt there. St. Luke passes over the second visit, probably because it would have involved tedious recapitulation. St. Mark does not give an account of the first, for the obvious reason that he begins his narrative of our Lord's work with His public ministry and the first call of His disciples at Capernaum; an observation applicable to St. Matthew also.

1. *And he went out from thence.*] This expression, as usual, indicates the commencement of a new missionary journey. The preceding circuit was wound up, after the return from Decapolis, by the great miracle just recorded. The word "thence" refers, therefore, to the city of Capernaum, not (as Meyer says) to the house of Jairus, where there is no reason to suppose that he sojourned.

*and came.*] Or, as the older MSS read, and "**He cometh;**" the change of tense, as usual in St. Mark, marks more distinctly the arrival at a different scene of action.

*and his disciples follow him.*] This, too, is noticeable. The twelve disciples were not with Him when He entered the house of Jairus, but joined Him, of course, when He was leaving Capernaum. Their presence at Nazareth was likely to produce a strong effect. Our Lord could no longer be regarded as an unknown youth with no recognised position. He came with a suite of adherents, some of whom must have been known, if not personally yet by repute, to the Nazarenes. Another special reason for noticing their presence was that in the course of His journey the disciples were to be sent forth for the first time as missionaries (see note on verse 7).

The direct journey from Capernaum would occupy about seven hours: southwards by the shore to Magdala; then, turning landwards, through Wadi Hummam (= Dovedale), passing Arbela, Kerne Hattim, and leaving Mount Tabor on the south-west, to Nazareth.

2. *And when the sabbath day was come.*] This implies that one day or more elapsed between His arrival and His public teaching. Keim supposes that they were passed in His mother's house; but His mother and elder brothers had left Nazareth—a fact which might have been inferred, had it not been elsewhere stated, from the distinction made in verse 3 between them and His sisters, who were still in the city. The time may have been passed in private (see next note) intercourse with former acquaintances, especially with the families of His sisters. His appearance in the synagogue would thus be looked for with new interest by those who had previously rejected Him.

*began to teach.*] A point noted by St. Mark, indicating that He had not previously taught in public.

*and many.*] Or, "the many," *i. e.* the greater part of those present. Some remained silent, either accepting His teaching or withholding all expression of surprise. The reading, however, is doubtful. ℵ A C D and the Coptic version omit the article.

*were astonished.*] The same word is used to describe the effect of His first public teaching (ch. i. 22).

*whence hath this man.*] St. Mark's account is less concise than St. Matthew's. He repeats the contemptuous expression, "this man," more than once. The word "given" is striking, intimating a new gift.

*that even, &c.*] Or, "**And such mighty works as are wrought by His hands.**"

3. *the carpenter.*] This is the only passage which expressly states that our Lord was Himself the carpenter of Nazareth. The Jews, wiser in this respect than most Christians, rightly held manual labour to be not merely compatible with the highest personal

Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him.

4 But Jesus said unto them, [b] A prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house.

[b] John 4. 44.

5 And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed *them*.

6 And he marvelled because of their unbelief. [c] And he went round about the villages, teaching.

[c] Matt. 9. 35. Luke 13. 22.

7 ¶ [d] And he called *unto him* the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and gave them power over unclean spirits;

[d] Matt. 10. 1.

---

distinction, but indispensable in some form to the condition of a public teacher.

*the son of Mary.*] The mother alone is mentioned—a point not sufficiently accounted for by the supposition, probably correct, that Joseph was now dead, for the son would still naturally be called after him. The expression was either contemptuous (cf. "sons of Zeruiah," 2 Sam. iii. 39), or more probably it indicated a difference between His position and that of the brothers and sisters by another mother. Renan quotes this text to prove that our Lord was known in Nazareth as the only child of the widow, 'Les Evangiles,' p. 542.

*the brother of James, &c.*] See note on Matt. xiii. 55.

*here.*] A word added in this Gospel. It marks a distinction between the sisters still in Nazareth and the brothers who had left. St. Matthew has "all" the sisters. They were probably married to Nazarenes.

4. *among his own kin.*] The word implies near relationship, and confirms the statement that Nazareth was the original home of Joseph.

*in his own house.*] This may imply that our Lord's nearest relatives, probably His sisters, with their families, occupied the house in which He had been brought up.

5. *And he could there do no mighty work.*] This striking expression, peculiar to St. Mark, involves the great doctrine that faith is the necessary condition of receiving help in body or soul from Jesus Christ.

*a few sick folk.*] St. Matthew implies that some few works were done; St. Mark notes the limitation. Some, who were not grievously ill, sought and obtained relief; but there were no extraordinary cases of restoration requiring strong faith, such as are recorded elsewhere.

6. *And he marvelled because of their unbelief.*] This statement, not less remarkable than the foregoing one, indicates a movement of our Lord's Spirit which might seem inconsistent with His insight into the human heart; cf. John ii. 25: but just in proportion to the clearness of reason is the surprise caused by unreasonableness. Our Lord is not only Divine, He is the ideal of human good sense. It should also be borne in mind that surprise at the obtuseness and unreasonableness of sin is constantly attributed to God by the prophets.

*the villages.*] The main point in this account is certainly the final rejection of our Lord by His own townsmen; but in closest connection with this comes the extension of His work. What the townsfolk of Nazareth would not receive was immediately offered to the villagers of the district. Nazareth was surrounded, as at present, by numerous detached villages, spread over the rich and populous plain of Esdraelon.

7–12. The Mission of the Disciples.

St. Mark brings this event into immediate connection with the preceding transactions. After a course of personal teaching through the district, our Lord, for the first time, sent His disciples forth to all parts of the country. The order thus presented differs from that of St. Matthew. Our Evangelist begins one great section with the selection of the Twelve (ch. iii. 7-19), and terminates it with their first mission.

7. *And he called, &c.*] The expression denotes a formal act. He called the whole of the disciples, and began to send them forth (*i.e.* sent them forth for the first time) two by two (not noted by St. Matthew) to work apart from Him: this was a distinct stage in their preparatory training.

*and gave them power.*] St. Mark uses here the imperfect tense, probably to intimate that He accompanied the gift with the exhortations that follow (Weiss). The gift was probably conveyed by some form, whether by laying on of hands (Meyer) or breathing (De Wette), is uncertain.

*over unclean spirits.*] Here St. Mark notes this power only; St. Matthew adds, "to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease." This is in accordance with St. Mark's usual style; but it has a distinct object, fixing attention upon the central object of the work—to contend against evil in every form, specially in its most conspicuous form (cf. ch. xvi. 17).

8 And commanded them that they should take nothing for *their* journey, save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no [1]money in *their* purse:

9 But *be* shod with sandals; and not put on two coats.

10 And he said unto them, In what place soever ye enter into an house, there abide till ye depart from that place.

11 [e]And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, [f]shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city.

12 And they went out, and preached that men should repent.

13 And they cast out many devils, [g]and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed *them*.

14 [h]And king Herod heard *of him*; (for his name was spread abroad:) and he said, That John the Baptist was risen from the dead, and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him.

15 Others said, That it is Elias.

[1] The word signifieth *a piece of brass money, in value somewhat less than a farthing*, Matt. 10. 9. but here it is taken in general for *money*.

[e] Matt. 10. 14.

[f] Acts 13. 51.

[g] James 5. 14.

[h] Matt. 14. 1.

---

8. These directions agree with those in St. Matthew, with a slight difference, "save a staff only." They were to go out prepared for the first day's journey, depending afterwards upon their Master's will. The staff permitted was, of course, the ordinary staff of a traveller; that which was forbidden may have been a weapon.

9. *two coats.*] Persons of distinction usually wore two tunics, the under one of fine linen.

11. *Verily I say . . . for that city.*] This clause is omitted in several old MSS, and by most editors. It may have been taken from another Synoptist. Here it stands on the authority of some uncials, most cursives and ancient versions.

12. *And they went out, and preached.*] The same words are used ch. xvi. 20, where see note. The expression emphatically denotes the main object of their mission, to which the power conferred on them was subsidiary.

13. This verse gives two results not directly noticed by the other Evangelists—the expulsion of evil spirits (see note on verse 7), and healing with the form of unction, mentioned only in this passage and in James v. 14. 'Unction, still applied as a remedy in the East, was efficacious by virtue of the power given to the disciples. That it was applied with prayer, and was connected with grace and forgiveness, may be inferred from St. James. A symbolical or sacramental character is assigned to such unction by modern as well as ancient critics; but it certainly was not administered as a viaticum *in extremis*.

This mission may have occupied some weeks, during which our Lord was engaged in His own work, probably visiting other places, among them Nain, where He does not seem to have been accompanied by the Twelve; compare Luke vii. 11 with viii. 1.

### 14–20. Herod's Inquiry.

14. *And king Herod.*] Or, **the king Herod.** This title did not properly belong to the Tetrarch (see note on Matt. xiv. 1), but it was probably applied to him by common usage, and it has a special fitness here, where the effects of the mission are described, extending even to the palace of the king. That Herod should then first have had his attention called to our Lord's work is satisfactorily accounted for. He was absent in Rome during the first part of our Lord's public ministry, and on his return, after Midsummer A.D. 29 (see Lewin, F. S. p. 185), he was occupied by the public and private troubles. The death of John Baptist took place probably in the winter of A.D. 30, or the early spring of A.D. 31; either immediately before or during the advent of our Lord in the district about Nazareth. At this time Herod appears to have been chiefly residing at Julias in Peræa.

*for his name was spread abroad.*] Or, was become famous; literally, manifest.

*and he said.*] This reading is supported by the majority of MSS, and adopted by most critics (Meyer, Tischendorf); others have "they said," *i. e.* such was the popular rumour; but the effect on Herod's mind is specially dwelt upon, nor is the emphatic reiteration in verse 16 contrary to St. Mark's style.

15. These conjectures are omitted by St. Matthew, who, as usual, condenses the narrative. They are important, as indicating the general increase of our Lord's personal influence. Elijah was looked for as the great restorer of all things at the approach of the Messiah; see note on Matt. xxvii. 47.

*a prophet, or as one of the prophets.*] More correctly, according to the best MSS, "a prophet as one of the prophets;" equal in

And others said, That it is a prophet, or as one of the prophets.

[i Luke 3. 19.] 16 [i] But when Herod heard *thereof*, he said, It is John, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead.

17 For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her.

18 For John had said unto Herod, [k Lev. 18. 16.] [k] It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.

19 Therefore Herodias had [1] a quarrel against him, and would have killed him; but she could not: [1 Or, an inward grudge.]

20 For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and [1] observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly. [1 Or, kept him, or, saved him]

21 And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief *estates* of Galilee;

22 And when the daughter of the

---

gifts and powers to the "old prophets" of St. Luke.

**16.** *Herod... said.*] St. Matthew adds, "to his servants." Herod, on hearing the various conjectures, says out what was in his mind: he believes that John the Baptist is come back to life. Late editors adopt a slightly different reading, "*John whom I beheaded, he is risen.*" An ingenious and learned writer, M. Lutteroth, holds that Herod adopted, whether believing it or not, a popular superstition that the spirits of the departed sometimes took possession of living persons, dwelt in them, and acted through them. This theory might suit the exclamation in verse 14, but is not compatible with the express statement in this passage, which can only refer to a resuscitation of the Baptist.

**19, 20.** This account of Herod's feelings and motives differs from that given by St. Matthew, still more from that by Josephus. The former represents Herod as wishing to slay John, but restrained by fear; the latter states that he put John to death, being jealous of his popularity and fearing an insurrection. The historical fact that he did murder John is not contested: it was matter of public notoriety. His motives must, of course, to a great extent have been matter of conjecture; nor was Josephus, humanly speaking, likely to be better informed than the Evangelists, both contemporaries, and one a subject, of Herod. St. Matthew would not be likely to enter upon a detailed inquiry into the motives of Herod: here, as elsewhere, he deals with broad facts. He uses, however, in verse 9, an expression which agrees with St. Mark's account so closely that it has been held by some (Weiss, Holtzmann) to prove that St. Matthew compiled his own narrative from it. That Herodias was the true instigator is too natural and reasonable a conclusion to justify the hypothesis that it was a mere popular rumour.

**20.** *feared John.*] He feared him as a man of God, whose death would be avenged. The Greek has "the John"—equivalent to "the man John."

*and observed him.*] This rendering is defended by some able critics (Fritzsche, "apud animum suum eum observabat"); but the true meaning is given by Jerome, "and he guarded him" (custodiebat); Herod's main object in keeping John in the fortress of Machærus, at a considerable distance from his own residence, being apparently to protect him from Herodias. So Bengel and nearly all late critics.

*he did many things.*] This implies that Herod acted, to some extent justly, under the influence of John: a probable result. A very different reading has been adopted by late editors and commentators, "he was much perplexed;" a statement which seems scarcely consistent with the next clause, "he heard him gladly." A man like Herod would not be likely to court perplexity. See note at end of chapter.

21-29. DEATH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

This account differs only in points of style from that of St. Matthew; St. Mark, as usual, giving fuller details.

**21.** *made a supper to his lords, &c.*] St. Matthew simply alludes to the presence of the great officers of state as the guests of Herod; but the special mention of the "*chief captains*," or **the tribunes**, is important; it tallies with the supposition that Herod was at that time collecting his forces to meet Aretas, the father of his repudiated wife. He was probably on that account occupying the fortress of Machærus, on the extreme border of his Tetrarchy. The excitement of the mother and daughter must have then risen to its highest point; and Herod might be disposed to bitter feelings against the saint who had openly taken part with the forsaken wife.

*chief estates.*] Rather, **chief men.**

said Herodias came in, and danced, and pleased Herod and them that sat with him, the king said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give *it* thee.

23 And he sware unto her, Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give *it* thee, unto the half of my kingdom.

24 And she went forth, and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist.

25 And she came in straightway with haste unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou give me by and by in a charger the head of John the Baptist.

26 And the king was exceeding sorry; *yet* for his oath's sake, and for their sakes which sat with him, he would not reject her.

27 And immediately the king sent [1] an executioner, and commanded his head to be brought: and he went and beheaded him in the prison,

[1] Or, *one of his guard.*

28 And brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel: and the damsel gave it to her mother.

29 And when his disciples heard *of it*, they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

30 [a] And the apostles gathered themselves together unto Jesus, and told him all things, both what they had done, and what they had taught.

[a] Luke 9. 10.

31 And he said unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile: for there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat.

32 And [b] they departed into a desert place by ship privately.

[b] Matt. 14. 13.

---

22. *the daughter of the said Herodias.*] Three MSS have "his daughter Herodias," a reading which cannot be accepted.

23. *unto the half of my kingdom.*] Similar promises are noticed in classical writers, cf. 'Iliad,' x. 612; Hygin. 'Fab.' 84.

24, 25. St. Matthew suppresses these graphic details, but states the result in one expressive word, "being instructed or prompted" by her mother. The A. V. there renders it incorrectly, "before instructed."

26. *he would not reject her.*] Literally, frustrate or disappoint, as in Ps. xv. 5, Prayer-book Version, following the Septuagint.

27. *an executioner.*] St. Mark uses the Latin word, "speculator," *i. e.* one of the body-guard, whom the emperors had lately introduced as attendants, messengers, and executioners. They are often mentioned about this time. Claudius is said not to have attended banquets without a suite of "speculators," armed with lances. The word is derived from *speculor*, to look out, to watch; by some, far less probably, from *spiculum*, a spear. It was adopted by the Hebrews, but specially in the sense "executioner," not uncommon in the Talmud (cf. Lightfoot, Schœttgen, and Buxtorf, Lex. Ch. s. v.).

29. *and took up his corpse.*] That Herod should give up the body to the disciples of the Baptist is a strong corroboration of the account of his feelings given by St. Mark. There is no ground for the tradition first mentioned by Jerome (c. Rufinum. iii. 42), that Herod flung the headless trunk over the battlements. Dr. Farrar suggests that Manaen might have been one of the disciples who took up the body. This is, of course, possible; but the foster-brother of Antipas should not be confounded with his namesake the Essene, who, according to Josephus, predicted the rise of Antipas.

30-44. THE RETURN OF THE APOSTLES, AND THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.

30. *And the apostles, &c.*] We thus return to the direct narrative, interrupted at verse 13. St. Mark, for the first and only time, here calls the disciples apostles: an expression which, taken in connection with their account of what they had done and taught, seems to indicate a great and decisive success. The place of meeting is not mentioned, but was probably Capernaum, where, as usual, a great throng was brought together on his return from missionary excursions.

31. *Come ye yourselves apart.*] The word "apart" is common to the three Synoptists. St. Mark assigns the reason why retirement was needed.

*a desert place.*] The desert place to which they retired was evidently the district to the east of the Jordan, on the north shore of the Sea of Galilee, then, as now, singularly desolate.

32. *by ship.*] In the ship, kept, as usual, at our Lord's disposal, on the shore near Capernaum.

33 And the people saw them departing, and many knew him, and ran afoot thither out of all cities, and outwent them, and came together unto him.

34 [c] And Jesus, when he came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things.

35 [d] And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, This is a desert place, and now the time *is* far passed:

36 Send them away, that they may go into the country round about, and into the villages, and buy themselves bread: for they have nothing to eat.

37 He answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred [1] pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?

38 He saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go and see. And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes.

39 And he commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the green grass.

40 And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties.

41 And when he had taken the

[c] Matt. 9. 36.

[d] Matt. 14. 15.

[1] The Roman penny is sevenpence halfpenny; as Matt. 18. 28.

---

33. *And the people, &c.*] Or, **and many saw them departing, and understood,** *i.e.* perceived in what direction they were going. Some few MSS omit "them," and others have "him" (thus A. V.); but there is ample authority for the reading here followed.

*out of all cities.*] **From all the cities,** that is, all the large towns on or near the way.

*and outwent them . . . unto him.*] Or, with a slight difference of order, "**and on foot** (or by land) **from all the cities ran together thither, and came before them** (so Tischendorf, with the oldest MSS and ancient Versions). The passage by sea would take some five or six hours; the distance by land from the place of starting does not exceed twenty miles. On the incidental confirmation by St. John (vi. 22) of the statement that the mass of the people went round by land, see Sanday on the Fourth Gospel, p. 126.

34. *when he came out.*] *I. e.* out of the ship. On landing He found the multitudes waiting for Him; He gave up at once the purpose for which He had retreated to the desert, and, as ever compassionate, He began to teach them. St. Matthew and St. Luke speak here of some cases of healing; but, considering the great haste with which the people were assembled, not many could have needed such relief. St. Matthew omits here the simile of the sheep, having used it on a previous occasion (ch. ix. 36); but it has a special fitness in reference to crowds hastily brought together from many places without leaders or teachers.

35. *And when the day was now far spent.*] Literally, "**and now it being a late hour.**" It must, however, have been some two or three hours before sunset. St. Luke, "the day began to wear away," *i. e.* in the afternoon. St. Matthew's "evening" must be taken broadly, from three o'clock to sunset.

*and now the time is far passed.*] **And it is now a late hour.** St. Mark repeats the phrase used in the beginning of the verse.

36. *the country round about.*] There may have been a few houses of husbandmen scattered over the adjoining district; but, as the next statement implies, there were no villages in the immediate neighbourhood.

*buy themselves bread: for they have nothing to eat.*] According to another reading, "buy themselves what they may eat."

37. *Shall we go, &c.*] The question indicates a twofold difficulty. The disciples would have to go away to some distance, and to make a large purchase: 200 denarii would be a larger sum than they would probably carry about with them; a smaller sum would not buy bread for five thousand men. See John vi. 7.

39. *by companies.*] Cf. Luke ix. 14.

*the green grass.*] A note of time. The grass in that district is not green after April. This event occurred probably in March. Weiss calls it a graphic detail: but it is of importance as distinguishing this from the similar miracle (c. viii. 6), and as indicating an eyewitness; doubtless, as Weiss also remarks, just as St. Peter would describe the proceedings.

40. *in ranks.*] Rather, "in squares, or divisions;" the Greek word is applied specially to garden-beds.

41. Our Lord's acts are described by the Synoptists in exactly the same words, fol-

five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to heaven, and blessed, and brake the loaves, and gave *them* to his disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all.

42 And they did all eat, and were filled.

43 And they took up twelve baskets full of the fragments, and of the fishes.

44 And they that did eat of the loaves were about five thousand men.

45 And straightway he constrained his disciples to get into the ship, and to go to the other side before [1] unto Bethsaida, while he sent away the people.

[1] Or, *over against Bethsaida.*

46 And when he had sent them away, he departed into a mountain to pray.

47 [e] And when even was come, the ship was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land.

[e] Matt. 14. 23.

48 And he saw them toiling in rowing; for the wind was contrary unto them: and about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking upon the sea, and would have passed by them.

49 But when they saw him walking upon the sea, they supposed it had been a spirit, and cried out:

50 For they all saw him, and were troubled. And immediately he talked with them, and saith unto them, Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid.

51 And he went up unto them into the ship; and the wind ceased: and they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered.

52 For they considered not *the miracle* of the loaves: for their heart was hardened.

53 [f] And when they had passed over, they came into the land of Gennesaret, and drew to the shore.

[f] Matt. 14. 34.

54 And when they were come out of the ship, straightway they knew him,

55 And ran through that whole re-

---

lowing, doubtless, the oral tradition of the Apostles.

*and gave . . . to set before them.*] "And gave (or went on giving) to the disciples, that they might set before them." The expression is very circumstantial, bringing out distinctly the ministerial act. The use of the imperfect tense, not "He gave," but He was giving, seems to imply that the miracle was completed in His hands, *i. e.* that each disciple came to him repeatedly for a fresh supply of bread. The notice of the distribution of the fish is peculiar to St. Mark.

**43.** *And they took up, &c.*] Render according to the reading of the best MSS, "And they took up twelve baskets **of fragments, full**" (or, complete) "**measures.**" See Prof. Lightfoot on Colossians, p. 326.

**44.** *five thousand men.*] St. Matthew expressly excludes women and children; but, considering the length and haste of the journey, comparatively few could have been present.

45-56. THE RETURN TO GENNESARET.

**45.** *unto Bethsaida.*] Not Bethsaida Julias, on the north-east of the lake, but Bethsaida, near Capernaum. The distinction between these two places is generally recognised. The name indicates a fishing village, and was probably common.

**48.** *would have passed by them.*] The intent is well explained by Weiss: our Lord's intention was to pass by them that they might see how the wind, against which they had been toiling all night, at once abated in His presence.

After this verse St. Mark omits the account given by St. Matthew (ch. xiv. 28-30) of St. Peter's act of faith. This is a remarkable illustration of a principle which pervades the Petrine Gospel. St. Mark never gives the first apostle the pre-eminence which the other Evangelists assign to him, except when he relates official and public acts.

**52.** *they considered not.*] Or, **they understood not,** their minds had not been opened by the miracle of the loaves. This is a very striking addition, and is justly regarded as an indication of originality. St. Mark is always careful to note any shortcomings of the Twelve.

**53-56.** The agreement with St. Matthew is very close; but some expressions, especially in verse 56, indicate more distinctly the duration and extent of journeys which must have occupied some considerable time—possibly, as McClellan (p. 570) holds, from March to June; so that a Passover and Pentecost intervened.

gion round about, and began to carry about in beds those that were sick, where they heard he was.

56 And whithersoever he entered, into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought him that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched [1]him were made whole.

[1] Or, *it*.

## NOTE on verse 20.

20.] For ἐποίει, the reading of all other MSS, א B L have ἠπόρει, supported by one ancient Version, the Coptic, which nearly always agrees with them. This reading is strongly maintained by Scrivener, 'Introd.' pp. 505, 506, adopted by McClellan, and by most German critics. It certainly was much easier for a copyist to substitute ἐποίει for ἠπόρει than the reverse: but the authorities seem insufficient to justify the acceptance of a reading, which is not easily reconcileable with the context. It is one instance among many in which the recension followed by those three MSS and the Coptic version is completely isolated.

## CHAPTER VII.

1 *The Pharisees find fault at the disciples for eating with unwashen hands.* 8 *They break the commandment of God by the traditions of men.* 14 *Meat defileth not the man.* 24 *He healeth the Syrophenician woman's daughter of an unclean spirit,* 31 *and one that was deaf, and stammered in his speech.*

THEN [g]came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which came from Jerusalem.

2 And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with [1]defiled, that is to say, with unwashen, hands, they found fault.

[g] Matt. 15. 1.

[1] Or *common*.

CHAP. VII.—1–13. CAVILS AT NEGLECT OF CEREMONIAL WASHING.

1. The time and place of this transaction are not distinctly intimated; but it was probably at the close of the circuit through Galilee, which followed the feeding of the five thousand. St. John (ch. vi. 66) says that, after the return of our Lord to Capernaum, there was a defection of many disciples, and (ch. vii. 1) that the Jews of Jerusalem sought to slay Him. This was some time before the Feast of Tabernacles, when He again went up to Jerusalem, but privately.

*came together . . . the Pharisees.*] **Come together.** St. Mark uses the historical present, thus separating the arrival of the Pharisees from the preceding occurrences. He also distinguishes the Pharisees — who had long since sought occasion to destroy our Lord—from the Scribes, who came apparently as a deputation from Jerusalem for the express purpose of collecting evidence of such violation of law as might insure His condemnation.

2. *and when they saw.*] Or, according to a reading preferred by Westcott and Hort, **and had seen.** This implies not that they observed the act after coming to our Lord, but that they came prepared to question Him, having previously noticed it. Cum vidissent, Jerome.

*that is to say, with unwashen, hands.*] An explanation of the expression "defiled" (literally, "common"), which would be needed by St. Mark's readers. The washing had no reference to cleanliness. Dr. Thomson, who gives some good illustrations of the custom still existing among the Metawiles in Phœnicia, observes, that "though both they and the Jews are afraid to associate with you, lest you should contaminate or pollute them, they are intolerably filthy both in their persons and habitations" ('Land and Book,' Part I. ch. xiii. 3, 4). This passage, peculiar to St. Mark, calls attention to the excessive scrupulosity of the Pharisees, probably with special reference to the Judaizers, who, at a very early period, formed an influential party at Rome. The extreme minuteness of details shows that such observances excited special interest; this might be expected of Roman converts, whose religion in heathenism had consisted chiefly in ceremonial forms. See M. Boissier, 'La Religion romaine,' i. pp. 14–17. They would wish to know exactly what the Jews did, and what Christians would be required to do.

*they found fault.*] These words are omitted by late editors, following old MSS of different

3 For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash *their* hands [1]oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders.

[1] Or, *diligently*: in the original, *with the fist*: Theophylact, *up to the elbow*.

4 And *when they come* from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, *as* the washing of cups, and [1]pots, brasen vessels, and of [1]tables.

[1] Sextarius is about a pint and an half.

[1] Or, *beds*.

5 Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands?

6 He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, [h]This people honoureth me with *their* lips, but their heart is far from me.

[h] Isai. 29. 13. Matt. 15. 8.

7 Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men.

8 For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, *as* the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do.

9 And he said unto them, Full well ye [1]reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.

[1] Or, *frustrate*.

10 For Moses said, Honour thy

---

recensions. They may have been inserted to facilitate the construction, which without them would be continued in *v.* 5.

**3.** *oft.*] This follows the Vulgate, which is supported by Tischendorf (see his note in the 8th edition). The generality of critics, however, prefer the far more difficult reading (πυγμῇ) *with the fist:* an expression which has given occasion to much controversy. Some take it to be equivalent to "vigorously" (Syr. diligently), for which there is no sufficient authority (see Fritzsche): some, indeed, hold it to denote merely superficial washing. Others interpret the word literally, as though the palm of one hand was rubbed with the other fist. To this there is the *prima facie* objection that no notice of such a process is found in Rabbinical writings, which would scarcely have failed to give minute and clear directions (cf. Buxtorf, Lex. Ch. s. v. מילה). Theophylact and Euthymius render it "up to the elbow." The Greek word (πυγμή) is understood by them to include the forearm from the end of the fingers to the elbow. This seems, on the whole, the most satisfactory explanation.

**4.** *from the market.*] Not because they might there be made personally unclean, but because they would come into contact with foreigners, slaves, and others ceremonially unclean. This punctiliousness was probably a ground on which the Jews are charged by Tacitus with "odium humani generis."

*they wash.*] Lit. baptize themselves.

*washing.*] St. Mark has "baptisms," denoting ceremonial sprinkling or immersion. "Washing" gives the impression that cleanliness was the object. The law of the Talmud is, that earthen vessels ceremonially defiled must be broken; metallic vessels, specially brazen or copper, must be purified.

*and of tables.*] Or "couches" on which foreigners, or others ceremonially unclean, might have lain. The reading, however, is doubtful, the word so rendered being omitted in the oldest MSS.

**5.** *Why walk not.*] The word "walk" has a technical significance. Why do they not observe the *halacha?* (literally, walking) *i. e.* the teaching of the Rabbis, which regulates the details of daily life.

*unwashen.*] Or, 'common,' *i. e.* 'defiled.' So the oldest MSS and late editions.

**8.** *laying aside.*] The antithesis is very exact, literally, "having cast away"—"ye hold fast." In this verse the words of God, in Isaiah xxix. 13, are adapted to the special occasion.

*the tradition of men.*] The words following these to the end of the verse are omittted by Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, following ℵ B L Δ, the Coptic and Armenian versions. They are not necessary to complete the sense, but are supported by independent witnesses of high authority.

**9.** *Full well.*] A strong expression, used in the literal sense above in verse 6 (where A. V. has "well"); here with severe sarcasm (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 4). This tone, in our Lord's indignant addresses to the Jews, is more frequently indicated by St. Mark than by the other Evangelists.

Two different words are here introduced in place of those used in verse 8: "reject" (ἀθετεῖτε, as in ch. vi. 26), or disannul, for "lay aside;" and for "hold," which indicates pertinacity, we have here "keep" or "observe" with religious care.

**10.** *For Moses said.*] St. Matthew, "for God said:" a striking attestation to the plenary inspiration of Moses, when he records the words of God.

father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death:

11 But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, *It is* [i] Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; *he shall be free.*

[i] Matt. 15. 5.

12 And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother;

13 Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.

14 ¶ [k] And when he had called all the people *unto him*, he said unto them, Hearken unto me every one *of you*, and understand:

[k] Matt. 15. 10.

15 There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man.

16 If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.

17 And when he was entered into the house from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable.

18 And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, *it* cannot defile him;

19 Because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?

---

**11.** *Corban.*] A Hebrew word, meaning that which is brought as an offering. Whatever might be required by a parent is refused on the ground that it has a prior and more sacred destination. The son might either make such reservation previously, or at the time, when he observed that his parent was about to ask for any article: in either case involving himself in a sin peculiarly hateful to God.

*he shall be free.*] These words may be omitted, if with late critics we also omit the word *and* in the following verse.

**13.** *which ye have delivered.*] A pointed application: it drives the charge home to the Scribes, who were there present as representatives of the teachers of the law.

*and many such.*] Here again we have the words of our Lord with greater fulness; passing from the special case, He glances at the general tendencies of the Pharisaic party.

This passage strikingly illustrates the difference in style between the two Evangelists. St. Matthew is clear, vigorous, compact; he writes as a man of business, keeping to the main point, and disregarding accessories. St. Mark, with ready apprehension, keen observation, and prompt sympathy, dwells on gestures, on turns of expression, and on indications of personal feeling; having also before him the special requirements of the readers for whom his work was more immediately destined. We might infer that both had the same narrative, whether oral or written, before them: the one slightly condensing it, the other adding to it touches supplied by St. Peter, whose memory was full of his Master's words, acts, and looks.

14–23. THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF UNCLEANNESS.

**14.** *unto him.*] Here the oldest MSS insert **again**; a slight, but not unimportant, addition to St. Matthew's statement. It shews that the people whom our Lord called together were the same who had been present before the discussion with the Scribes, which appears, therefore, to have taken place within the house, to which He returned afterwards (see v. 17).

*Hearken unto me every one of you.*] The command is expressed more forcibly than in St. Matthew (ἀκούσατε—according to the best MSS—for ἀκούετε) and more generally; every one is called upon to hear the discourse which developed the true principle of uncleanness.

**15.** This verse again adds some details: "*from without a man*" literally, "**the man,**" anything external to a man; *can defile him*, can possibly defile him; *which come out of him*, or **which cometh forth out of the man**—"the man" thus being designated as the source. St. Matthew has "out of the mouth."

St. Mark omits some important sayings, which are recorded on this occasion by St. Matthew, ch. xv. 12–14.

**16.** This verse is omitted by some late editors, following as usual one recension: but the words are emphatic, and rest on good authority.

**17.** *into the house.*] See note on verse 14.

*his disciples.*] St. Peter, as usual, speaking in their name (cf. Matt. xv. 15).

**18, 19.** *cannot defile him .. heart.*] Omitted by St. Matthew; but, whether expressed or

20 And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man.

21 [a]For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders,

22 Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness:

23 All these evil things come from within, and defile the man.

24 ¶ [b]And from thence he arose, and went into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and entered into an house,

[a] Gen. 6. 5 & 8. 21. Matt. 15. 19.

[b] Matt. 15. 21.

---

not, essential to the full interpretation. The repetition, however, is characteristic of St. Mark's Gospel.

*purging all meats.*] The construction presents some difficulty. One view is, that the word rendered "purging" (literally, "cleansing," "making, or declaring pure") is a remark appended by the Evangelist, and referring to the intention of the Speaker; in which case the sense would be that our Lord, by giving this explanation, declared that food of any kind—being, of course, received with thankfulness—does not make a man really unclean. Adopting this view, we should render the words *he spoke thus* cleansing all meats. This interpretation, first found in Chrysostom on St. Matthew, p. 526 A, commends itself by its simplicity and high significance: it corresponds very exactly, both in expression and meaning, with the great saying in Acts x. 15, "What God hath cleansed, that call thou not common." The only objection of weight is, that such a statement anticipates a declaration made long afterwards; but to this it may be answered that the words do not form part of our Lord's discourse, but are a reflection made by the narrator; and that such an observation would be one that St. Peter would naturally make when he was inculcating the lesson. There is no real difficulty in the view that it is a remark of the Evangelist, more especially since the next verse begins with "and He said," or "went on saying." Still the generality of commentators (Fritzsche, Meyer, Weiss, &c.) connect it with the word "draught;" the meaning, as they hold, being that the "draught," or sewer, carries off all impurities: the food, which is assimilated, is good, remains in the system; that which does not benefit and might defile is carried away. The construction, however, which must be adopted to bring out this sense is intricate and ungrammatical, especially if the true reading be, as is now generally admitted, καθαρίζων. On the whole, the interpretation first proposed is decidedly preferable. It is well defended by Field in his note on the passage of Chrysostom quoted above: it is accepted also by Dr. Scrivener and other English critics; the meaning is recognised as most satisfactory by Baur, and Köstlin, p. 326.

21. *For from within.*] Repeated in verse 23, omitted in both places by St. Matthew. The enumeration of evils in this and the following verse is more complete than in St. Matthew, but the classification is not so obviously correct. St. Matthew follows the Decalogue, from evil thoughts proceeding to murder, then to adultery, then to theft, then to false witness, concluding with blasphemy, the great sin against the Spirit of God; in all, he presents six forms of evil. St. Mark has thirteen, in which the principle of order is somewhat obscure. If we separate the evil thoughts, the general source of evil, from their outward manifestations, we find six sets of sins in the plural (including in the Greek the first two in verse 22), six in the singular: of these the former set relates to acts, the latter to habits or principles; but the distinction is not easily proved. The climax is "foolishness;" all evil culminates in a total eclipse of moral and intellectual light (cf. Ps. xiv. 1; Rom. i. 21, 28, 31).

24-30. THE JOURNEY THROUGH PHŒNICIA.

24. *And from thence he arose, and went.*] Or went away. The beginning of a journey, differing in some important respects from any previously recorded, is thus distinctly marked. After the discussion above related, our Lord not only left the district, but for the first time entered a foreign and heathen country. There may, therefore, be suggested a reference to the discourse in which ceremonial uncleanness had been set on a new footing, especially considering the connection of the full declaration of the true principle with the reception of the heathen in Acts x. 15, 28; and the proceedings in Phœnicia are unquestionably preparatory to that great crisis; but the immediate object of the journey, as then understood by the disciples, would seem to have been withdrawal from the tumultuous excitement in Galilee. Privacy is dwelt on by St. Mark, in the last clause of this verse, as a special motive; it seems, however, evident that the further instruction of the Twelve was mainly contemplated.

*the borders.*] It is evident from this passage, compared with verse 27, that our Lord actually passed through Phœnicia.

*and Sidon.*] This is omitted by some MSS,

and would have no man know *it:* but he could not be hid.

25 For a *certain* woman, whose young daughter had an unclean spirit, heard of him, and came and fell at his feet:

26 The woman was a [1]Greek, a Syrophenician by nation; and she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter.

[1] Or, *Gentile.*

27 But Jesus said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast *it* unto the dogs.

28 And she answered and said unto him, Yes, Lord: yet the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs.

29 And he said unto her, For this saying, go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.

30 And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed.

31 ¶ And again, departing from

---

and may possibly have been inserted from St. Matthew; but it is strongly supported.

*and entered into an house.*] This marks an entire change. In Palestine we always read of His addressing the people; here He enters a house, evidently because it was not then His intention to teach or to work miracles. See Wichelhaus, 'Acad. Vorl. N. T.' vol. ii. p. 254.

*he could not be hid.* His fame had already spread through the district, see ch. iii. 8.

**25.** *heard of him, and came.*] The woman heard of Him, though, as St Matthew expressly states and as St. Mark implies, she lived at some distance within the Tyrian district, and she came immediately (straightway is added in the oldest MSS) into the house where our Lord was at this time. This is not noticed by St. Matthew, whose account might imply that she followed our Lord in the public road; but the difference in details is only apparent. Comparing the two statements, we may infer that the disciples, seeing the woman enter the house, followed her (St. Matthew, verse 23, says, "They came to Him"), and told Him that up to that time she had been crying after them.

**26.** *a Greek.*] The word "Greek" here, as in the Acts of the Apostles and in early Christian writers, is equivalent to "heathen." Here it corresponds to the 'Canaanitish woman' of St. Matthew.

**27.** *Let the children first be filled.*] This saying is not recorded by St. Matthew; it prepares the way for the still harder saying which follows. Our Lord's intention has been questioned, but it may be explained by the effect which His word produced, and which He certainly foresaw and willed. It elicited an expression of strong faith and deep humility, and shewed the power of prayer, thus giving the disciples a lesson, such as no direct admonition would have enforced more powerfully.

**28.** *yet the dogs under the table.*] Two slight touches: dogs, literally, little dogs, "whelps" (Vulgate, catelli), in antithesis to "children;" and "under the table," contrasted with the children's position.

*the children's.*] St. Matthew has "their masters':" no real discrepancy, but a different shade of meaning. What St. Mark, or St. Peter, felt specially was the tenderness of Christ to His own, and their coldness to those still without.

**29.** *For this saying, &c.*] This is one of the very few instances in which our Lord's words really differ in the two accounts. It is evident that each Evangelist gives part only of His answer; but it is not easy to reconcile them verbally. St. Matthew seems to adhere more closely to the original Apostolic tradition; while St. Mark appears to have rested on the account of St. Peter, anxious to draw out the effect of the woman's expostulation, and to state exactly what our Lord promised. Neither Evangelist could have had the narrative of the other before him; in that case the omissions and discrepancies would be unaccountable; but the words, one very peculiar (ψιχίων), which they have in common, indicate a common source.

**30.** The Evangelist, with his usual liveliness of sympathy, follows the woman to her house, and realizes her feelings when she found her child prostrate (τὸ παιδίον βεβλημένον), but quiet, on her couch, and thus knew at once that the evil thing had departed.

This narrative marks a great crisis in the training of the disciples. It was the first clear indication of the line which they were themselves to follow in dealing with the heathen, and it foreshadowed the different characteristics of leading parties in the early Church.

31-37. THE RETURN FROM PHŒNICIA, AND THE HEALING ON THE WAY.

**31.** *And again . . of Tyre and Sidon.*] Or, "and again, having gone forth from the

the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he came unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis.

32 And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and they beseech him to put his hand upon him.

33 And he took him aside from the multitude, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spit, and touched his tongue;

34 And looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened.

35 And straightway his ears were

---

**borders of Tyre, he went through Sidon"** ("through," not "and"—so the oldest MSS and Versions). This notice is important. From St. Matthew we gather only that He returned to the Sea of Galilee. From St. Mark we learn that He made a considerable circuit outside of Palestine, the only instance of such a course; passing through the old capital of heathen Phœnicia, and thence probably by the great road across Libanus and Antilibanus to Damascus (reckoned by Pliny among the cities of the Decapolis), thence to Cæsarea Philippi and to the eastern coast of the Sea of Galilee. This explanation meets the objection of Dr. Scrivener, 'Introd.' p. 473.

*Decapolis.*] This is not, properly speaking, a district, but a name given generally to the territories of ten great cities, of which lists, differing in some points, are given by Josephus (Vit. lxv. 74; B. J. 2, xviii. 1; 3, ix. 7); by Pliny (H. N. v. 16); by Ptolemy (v. 16); and in the Talmud (Demai, fol. 22, 23, see Lightfoot). The principal cities were Damascus, Gadara, Hippo, Pella, and Scythopolis, or Bethshean. See note on Matt. iv. 35. "This great journey through Greeks, Canaanites, Syrians, and Arabians, of the Gentiles, prepared the way for the Apostles, specially him of the Gentiles." Volkmar.

**32.** *And they bring unto him.*] This implies that He was, for a time at least, stationed near the sea of Galilee. Thus St. Matthew (xv. 29) describes Him as seated, or taking up a tempoary abode on "the mountain," *i. e.* on a height, as contrasted with the plain. See too ch. viii. 1.

*had an impediment.*] The Greek word implies that the man could scarcely speak. Such a condition is an ordinary result of long-continued deafness; and it may be inferred, not that he was deaf from his birth, in which case the removal of deafness would scarcely have been followed by fluent utterance, but that hearing had been totally lost, as is frequently the case after acute attacks of fever, and that when it was restored the man was enabled to speak correctly (cf. verse 35). N.B.—Weiss is not borne out by usage in rendering μογιλάλος speechless, notwithstanding the rendering of Isai. xxxv. 6 by the LXX; see Grimm, Lex. N. T. s. vv. μογγιλάλος and μογιλάλος.

*to put his hand upon him.*] Thus dictating, like Naaman, the mode of cure, but with reference to our Lord's usual action. The change of method is remarkable, and doubtless significant.

**33.** *and he took him aside from the multitude.*] Note the coincidence. St. Mark had not previously spoken of the multitude mentioned by St. Matthew, xv. 30; here he notices their presence incidentally, in reference to our Lord's withdrawal. *Aside*, or apart: the cure was to be wrought in private; the significant acts being intended partly for the deaf man, partly for His own disciples. Thus He put (literally, thrust, ἔβαλεν) His fingers into the ears, probably to make the deaf man aware that a process of healing was intended.

*and he spit.*] Some assume that our Lord touched his own fingers with saliva, as a medicinal process, not in itself efficacious, but made so by Divine energy (Weiss). This is doubtful, though it may seem to some extent to be supported by John ix. 6. The spitting may possibly denote an act of exorcism; so it would seem to have been understood by the Latin Church, in which the officiating priest touches the nostrils and ears of those who are to be baptized with moisture from his mouth. This rite is ancient, and it is remarkable as being observed only by that Church for which St. Mark specially wrote. Archbishop Trench, however, gives the best explanation: "Christ by these signs would awaken his faith, and stir up in him the lively expectation of a blessing" ('Notes on the Miracles,' p. 349).

**34.** *And looking up to heaven.*] Thus referring the healing power to His Father (cf. Matt. xiv. 19; John xi. 41, 42).

*he sighed.*] Or "groaned." Here also compare John xi. 35, 38, where the same strong feeling, caused by the sight of human suffering, is expressed, though by a different word.

*Ephphatha.*] St. Mark thus again (see ch. v. 14) preserves the original word of Christ. It applies to the ear—not, as some explain, to the tongue. See the next verse.

**35.** *straightway.*] The immediate result was the power of articulate speech. By the word rendered "string," literally, "bond," any kind of impediment may be designated. In this

opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain.

36 And he charged them that they should tell no man: but the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published *it*;

37 And were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well: he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.

## CHAPTER VIII.

*1 Christ feedeth the people miraculously: 10 refuseth to give a sign to the Pharisees: 14 admonisheth his disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod: 22 giveth a blind man his sight: 27 acknowledgeth that he is the Christ, who should suffer and rise again: 34 and exhorteth to patience in persecution for the profession of the Gospel.*

IN those days [c] the multitude being very great, and having nothing to eat, Jesus called his disciples *unto him*, and saith unto them,

[c] Matt. 15. 32.

2 I have compassion on the multitude, because they have now been with me three days, and have nothing to eat:

3 And if I send them away fasting to their own houses, they will faint by the way: for divers of them came from far.

4 And his disciples answered him, From whence can a man satisfy these *men* with bread here in the wilderness?

5 And he asked them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven.

6 And he commanded the people to sit down on the ground: and he took the seven loaves, and gave thanks, and brake, and gave to his disciples to set before *them*; and they did set *them* before the people.

---

case the difficulty of speaking seems to have arisen from stone-deafness.

*his ears.*] Literally, "his hearings," the channels through which sounds are transmitted to the inner sense.

*he spake plain.*] Literally, "he spoke aright," *i. e.* correctly; the words, therefore, which had been previously uttered were either inarticulate or full of mistakes.

**36.** *he charged them, &c.*] This injunction was, of course, given to those who brought the deaf man. It shows why He had withdrawn from the multitude, not wishing to impress the people with a feeling of His power, but to confer a blessing on an individual sufferer, and to instruct His disciples. It is to be remarked that each great accession of fame, each sudden extension of influence, was the result of a spontaneous feeling on the part of the witnesses of such acts. It was, in some true sense, contrary to His own wish. He would not be publicly recognised as the Messiah by an untrained and easily excited multitude.

**37.** *beyond measure astonished.*] St. Mark coins a word (ὑπερπερισσῶς) to express their boundless astonishment. The other word, rendered "astonished," he uses repeatedly on such occasions.

*all things.*] This implies, what St. Matthew states, ch. xv. 30, 31, that other works were then wrought, this being especially significant and impressive. If the Syrophœnician woman represented the Gentile Church, so this man may represent the Jewish Church, not hearing the word with the spiritual ear, and therefore not speaking clear and correct words of doctrine; when, at His touch, it recovers the inward sense, it speaks aright, sound and true doctrine.

*dumb.*] Literally, "speechless;" not the same word which the Evangelist used in verse 32. He is now shewing the impression made upon the multitude.

### CHAP. VIII.—1–9. THE FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND.

**1.** *In those days.*] From this notice, combined with the preceding accounts, it would seem that our Lord remained some time in the region to the north-east of the Sea of Galilee. This is probable for other reasons. It was out of the dominion of Herod Antipas, and, being sparsely peopled in most parts, it gave ample opportunities for retirement and private instruction. There was, therefore, an interval after the miracle just recorded.

*the multitude.*] According to the reading of the oldest MSS and Versions, "**again the multitude being great.**" The people were reassembled, and not, as previously (see Matt. xv. 29) on the high land, but on a level spot adjoining the lake.

**3.** *for divers of them came from far.*] Rather, "**and some of them are come from afar.**" They are our Lord's words: not, as might seem from the A. V., an observation of the Evangelist.

7 And they had a few small fishes: and he blessed, and commanded to set them also before *them*.

8 So they did eat, and were filled: and they took up of the broken *meat* that was left seven baskets.

9 And they that had eaten were about four thousand: and he sent them away.

10 ¶ And straightway he entered into a ship with his disciples, and came into the parts of Dalmanutha.

11 [d] And the Pharisees came forth, and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him.

[d] Matt. 1.

12 And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek after a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation.

13 And he left them, and entering into the ship again departed to the other side.

---

**8.** *seven baskets*] or **hampers**. A different word is used in ch. vi. 43: a point of importance as shewing that the two narratives refer to different occasions. On the former occasion the disciples had probably brought with them a supply of small baskets in common use; on this they seem to have had panniers or hampers, such as might be needed for a lengthened stay. In the only other passage where the word (σπυρίς) occurs, it denotes a hamper large enough to hold a man, 2 Cor. xi. 33.

The near resemblance between the two miracles of eeding is regarded by some critics as a proof that we have two versions of one event. See note on Matt. xv. 32. But this occurs in the midst of a narrative full of distinctive details, and it has indications of a different season; we do not read, as in ch. vii. 39, that the people sat down on the green grass, but on the bare earth—a point of some importance (see Greswell, 'Diss.' vol. iii. p. 402); nor is there any improbability in the repetition, considering on the one hand that many of the people were at a great distance from their homes, on the other, that the strong impression made by the former miracle upon the disciples had not been accompanied by a corresponding clearness of apprehension; they needed further instruction, aptly preceded by a new manifestation of power. On the omission by St. Luke, see note on Luke iv. 16.

10–13. DEMAND FOR A SIGN FROM HEAVEN.

**10.** *into a ship.*] **The ship**, a point of some importance, indicating that, as on former occasions, it was at hand: it must, therefore, either have been kept there in readiness, or have been sent for during the somewhat lengthened sojourn.

*Dalmanutha.*] St. Matthew (xv. 39) has Magdala in our Version, but the oldest MSS and Versions there read Magadan, which Dean Mansel (see note *in loc.*) thinks may be another form of the word Magdala: but neither Evangelist says that our Lord passed over to the other side, and, as the preceding transactions were certainly on the north-east, it may be inferred that Dalmanutha, probably identical with Magadan, was situate lower down on the same side. Neither name is known from other sources. Some old Versions and Latin Fathers read Magedan in this passage, probably taken from St. Matthew.

**11.** *came forth.*] This implies that they resided elsewhere, thus supporting the view just stated. St. Matthew (see note *in loc.*) mentions Sadducees as coming also, which Weiss thinks improbable; but the Sadducees represented the party of the Chief Priests, who were specially bent upon overthrowing our Lord's influence. See note on verse 15.

*a sign from heaven.*] In addition to the points noticed in the notes on St. Matthew, it may be observed that special signs from heaven were expected to usher in Messiah's kingdom. This question was intended as a test: if He refused, it would be represented as an admission that He was not the Messiah, in which case any neglect or violation of tradition would be punishable by law.

The inference drawn by some late writers from our Lord's answer throws light upon the motives of some at least among the questioners of His own day. They take it to be tantamount to an admission that He had not the power of working miracles at all: a construction which the Sadducees, at least, would readily have adopted and urged.

**12.** *And he sighed deeply.*] The sigh or groaning of grief and indignation; grief, however, preponderating. Grimm renders the word, which in the N. T. occurs here only, "ab imo pectore suspiria duco." It is remarkable that St. Mark omits the exception —the sign of the prophet Jonah, Matt. xvi. 4 —probably because the reference would not be understood by his readers without a lengthened explanation.

**13.** *to the other side.*] To the western shore of the lake, as we read in verse 22, near Bethsaida.

[e Matt. 16. 5.] 14 ¶ [e] Now *the disciples* had forgotten to take bread, neither had they in the ship with them more than one loaf.

15 And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and *of* the leaven of Herod.

16 And they reasoned among themselves, saying, *It is* [f] because we have no bread. [f Matt. 16. 7.]

17 And when Jesus knew *it*, he saith unto them, Why reason ye, because ye have no bread? perceive ye not yet, neither understand? have ye your heart yet hardened?

18 Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?

19 When I brake the five loaves among five thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve.

20 And when the seven among four thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? And they said, Seven.

21 And he said unto them, How is it that ye do not understand?

22 ¶ And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him.

23 And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town; and when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought.

24 And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking.

25 After that he put *his* hands

---

14–21. THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES.

**14.** *had forgotten to take bread.*] The passage would take five or six hours, so that the neglect might cause some inconvenience. It may indicate some trouble of the disciples' mind. Judas, who had specially the charge of the provisions (see John xiii. 29) was certainly not unlikely to have been shaken by the Pharisees' question, and disappointed by his Master's answer.

**15.** *the leaven of Herod.*] An indirect coincidence, identifying the Sadducees of St. Matthew with the adherents of Herod. They were, in fact, the secularist party, attached, as such, to the High Priests in Jerusalem and to the tetrarch in Galilee. See note on Matt. xxi. 6. The repetition of the word "leaven" refers to the difference between the principles of the Pharisees and the Herodians.

**17.** *your heart yet hardened.*] This clause, with the following, brings out distinctly the main point—the strange obtuseness of the disciples, still unable to discern the spiritual significance of the miracle. See note on Matt. xvi. 7.

**20.** *how many baskets, &c.*] Or **how many hampers did you take, full measures** of fragments. See Prof. Lightfoot on Colossians, p. 326.

**21.** *How is it that ye do not understand?*] Or, according to good MSS, 'do not **yet** understand.' St. Matthew adds that the meaning then flashed on them.

22–26. HEALING OF A BLIND MAN.

This miracle is related by St. Mark only. It may be regarded as significant of a spiritual process, such as was then gradually going on in the minds of the disciples.

**22.** *And he cometh to Bethsaida.*] The port, where they would land on their way to Capernaum, to which, as usual after completing a circuit, our Lord would then seem to be returning. Bethsaida Julias, on the north-east of the lake, which some suppose to be meant, was a considerable city, not, as this is called, a village (see note on next verse), nor was it on the sea-shore; cf. Josephus, 'B. J.' 3, x. 7.

*they bring . . . and besought.*] Or **beseech.**

*to touch him.*] See note on ch. vii. 32.

**23.** *out of the town.*] **Out of the village.** Bethsaida was not a city, nor what the Evangelists call "a village-town," but simply a village, chiefly inhabited by fishermen. Our Lord led the man out, as He had done in the case of the deaf and dumb in ch. vii. 33; the miracle was not for the public, but for the benefit of an individual and for the instruction of the disciples.

*had spit.*] This confirms the first interpretation in the note on ch. vii. 33. The Life in Jesus pervaded all His nature; such an act had a sacramental import, cf. John ix. 6. Here it was followed by the laying on of hands.

**24.** *I see men as trees, walking.*] The answer is peculiar; literally, according to the oldest MSS, "I see the men, for as trees I see some walking." The meaning is, "I certainly see the men; that is to say, I see as it were trees—large indistinct objects—yet not trees, for they are moving."

again upon his eyes, and made him look up: and he was restored, and saw every man clearly.

26 And he sent him away to his house, saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell *it* to any in the town.

g Matt. 16. 13.

27 ¶ g And Jesus went out, and his disciples, into the towns of Cæsarea Philippi: and by the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Whom do men say that I am?

28 And they answered, John the Baptist: but some *say*, Elias; and others, One of the prophets.

29 And he saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ.

---

**25.** *and made him look up.*] So most MSS; but not the oldest, which have "and he saw well (διέβλεψε), and was restored." N.B.—The form, preserved in nearly all the best MSS, of the word which is rendered "he was restored" is anomalous here, as in ch. iii. 5, where see note. Its recurrence here is important, as confirming the view there taken that both Evangelists used a common provincial form.

**26.** *into the town.*] **The village**, as above. The man may not have been a native of Bethsaida, but he would naturally have returned there but for the prohibition.

The last words, "nor tell it to any," are omitted by Tischendorf, following his usual authorities, but they are well supported.

With this miracle St. Mark winds up the account of the journey commenced in ch. vii. 24. As our Lord set out then from Capernaum, He probably now returned thither, before His last journey in northern Palestine.

27–38. THE GREAT CONFESSION IN THE DISTRICT OF CÆSAREA PHILIPPI, AND SUBSEQUENT EXHORTATIONS.

**27.** *went out, and his disciples into the towns.*] Each of these expressions has a special importance. *Went out* is the word regularly used in this Gospel when a departure from one scene of work to another is notified. In this case, our Lord, leaving the district in which He had hitherto been chiefly working, proceeded in a north-easterly direction along the valley of the Upper Jordan towards Paneas, which had lately been enlarged and fortified by the Tetrarch Philip, and named by him Cæsarea Philippi (see note on Matt. xvi. 13). The scenery of this district is fully described by modern travellers, *e.g.* Stanley, 'S. P.' pp. 393–398, and Thomson, L. B. ii. xv.

*and his disciples.*] Their presence is here mentioned expressly, calling attention to the object of a journey through a district to a great extent heathen and lately traversed, viz. their special instruction.

*into the towns.*] **Into the villages**, shewing that our Lord did not enter the city, but remained some time in the adjoining district.

*and by the way.*] St. Matthew has "when Jesus came," which though differing from St. Mark's account, is easily reconciled with it. They were now in the district, but still on their way northwards; but, though it was on the way, the question appears from St. Luke ix. 18 to have been addressed to the disciples privately, at a time set apart for prayer.

*men.*] St. Luke has "the multitudes," marking still more clearly the distinction between the disciples and the people.

**28.** *And they answered.*] Rather, **but they answered**, or said (a different reading adopted by Tisch.). The word "but" is important, indicating that the answer was somewhat different from what might have been expected. The question would seem calculated to elicit a spontaneous expression of their own belief.

St. Mark omits, as usual, the name of the prophet, Jeremiah; see notes on ch. i. 1.

**29.** *And Peter.*] Omit the word "and" (thus the oldest MSS and the Vulgate). The abruptness of the construction suits the suddenness of the answer, characteristic of St. Peter.

*Thou art the Christ.*] So much of St. Peter's answer St. Mark must needs record; but with a striking reserve he omits the fuller confession, and the great word of our Saviour addressed to St. Peter and related fully by St. Matthew. The true and satisfactory explanation is that St. Peter, speaking by St. Mark, did not choose to give prominence to his own name. Of this many indications have been noticed in St. Mark's gospel, none, however, so strong and conclusive as this. The omission proves, moreover, that the doctrine of the Church of Rome, making St. Peter the foundation on which the Church rests, is not apostolic. Neither St. Peter nor St. Mark could have omitted to record an essential truth. It is remarkable that the Gospel which gives special prominence to the rebuke, and least prominence to the great confession of St. Peter, was that which was written at Rome, and in the first place for Roman readers.

30 And he charged them that they should tell no man of him.

31 And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and *of* the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.

32 And he spake that saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him.

33 But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

34 ¶ And when he had called the people *unto him* with his disciples also, he said unto them, [a] Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

[a] Matt. 10. 38.

35 For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it.

36 For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?

37 Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

38 [b] Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in

[b] Matt. 10. 33.

---

30. *he charged them.*] So St. Matthew; but here the word is much stronger. He **rebuked** them, charged them sternly. St. Luke has two words, combining the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark.

31. *he began.*] St. Matthew, "from that time forth began;" ch. xvi. 21, where see note. Now, for the first time, the disciples received full and clear information of the sufferings and death of Christ. Words had previously been spoken which might to some extent have prepared them (see note on ch. ii. 19); now, the full confession of faith being made and accepted, it was important that the true, specific character of the Messiah should be set forth as it had been revealed by the greatest of the prophets (Isaiah liii.), in contradistinction from the notions then popularly entertained and still shared by the disciples.

*be rejected.*] An expressive word, meaning properly, "rejected after examination." Compare the account in ch. xiv. 53–65.

*after three days.*] St. Matthew and St. Luke, "on the third day." A duration of three full days is not necessarily implied by either expression. What it designates is an interval—one full day intervening between the day of death and the day of resurrection—long enough to make the fact of real death certain, but short compared with the time which would elapse before the general Resurrection.

32. *openly.*] "Without reserve." St. Mark thus accounts for St. Peter's excitement: the prediction to him was new and startling.

*took him.*] St. Peter was following (see next verse), and took hold of Him, as wishing to speak to Him apart (Grimm thus explains the word, "manu prehendo aliquem seorsim abducturus"); to this act of undue familiarity he ventured for the first time to add words of rebuke. The words are given by St. Matthew; they shew affection and reverence, winning sympathy for the speaker, who, however, felt himself that he deserved blame for want of faith.

33. *when he had turned about.*] A sudden movement is indicated, and a rapid glance at the disciples, indicating anger and surprise (cf. ch. iii. 5 and note). Looking at all, He singles out Peter for special warning.

*thou savourest.*] Or, **mindest**, as in Rom. viii. 5, *seq.*

34. *And when he had called the people.*] The words which follow were therefore spoken soon after, but not in immediate connection with, the rebuke addressed to the disciple. Our Lord called the people to Him: all needed the lesson He was about to give. St. Matthew speaks only of the disciples: one mark among many of the mutual independence of these two gospels. It is evident that all the people of that district, in which the last great miracle of feeding had been lately wrought, were impressed with the feeling that a new manifestation of His power was at hand. That feeling our Lord does not deal with, but warns all alike of the conditions of discipleship. Here, for the first time in St. Mark's gospel, we find the distinct mention of the Cross.

35–37. St. Matthew has the same words. St. Luke records them on a later occasion (ch. xiv. 25–27). They are so closely connected with the following passage that it seems strange any should have held them to be here an interpolation.

38. *shall be ashamed.*] This refers to the shame which prevents open acknowledgment

this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

## CHAPTER IX.

*2 Jesus is transfigured. 11 He instructeth his disciples concerning the coming of Elias: 14 casteth forth a dumb and deaf spirit: 30 foretelleth his death and resurrection: 33 exhorteth his disciples to humility: 38 bidding them not to prohibit such as be not against them, nor to give offence to any of the faithful.*

AND he said unto them, [c] Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.

[c] Matt. 16. 28.

2 ¶ [d] And after six days Jesus taketh *with him* Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart by themselves: and he was transfigured before them.

[d] Matt. 17. 1.

---

of belief in Christ, specially in Him as the crucified Saviour, and in His words—that is, in all His doctrinal teaching. The temptation is especially forcible when there is inward sympathy with the licentious and lawless. St. Mark, who is followed by St. Luke, brings out the full force of this saying. Was it that it made a peculiarly deep impression on St. Peter, the first of the disciples who, moved by shame and fear, denied his Saviour? The saying certainly finds in that fall a most striking illustration; but at the same time a proof was then given that even such apostasy, when repented of, does not preclude pardon.

*the Son of man.*] The word has been previously used by St. Matthew; see note on v. 27. Here it has a peculiar force, as referring to the great prophecy of Daniel, vii. 13. See note on ch. xiv. 62.

CHAP. IX.—1–8. THE TRANSFIGURATION.

1. In St. Matthew's gospel (ch. xvi. 28) this verse is more correctly assigned to the preceding chapter; but the division here adopted serves to point out the very close connexion between the transfiguration and the previous discourse.

*the kingdom of God come with power.*] St. Matthew, ch. xvi. 28, has "the Son of man coming in His kingdom:" on the bearing of both expressions see notes on that passage. The transfiguration was at once a symbol, a pledge, and a partial manifestation of the glory of Messiah's kingdom; and in this light it is referred to by St. Peter in his second epistle, ch. i. 16. As such, it was vouchsafed at the crisis when its significance would be likely to be felt; for it brought out distinctly two aspects of Christ's person and work, just after the Apostles had shewn that their convictions were clear and full; when, on the one hand, He had assured them of the establishment, perpetuity, and triumph of His Church, and had directed their minds to His second advent; when, on the other hand, He had clearly announced the sufferings by which His resurrection would be preceded. All this teaching is now presented in living outward act, in the transaction which forms the central, culminating point in our Lord's ministerial life.

2. *after six days.*] In the note on Matt. xvii. 1, it has been observed that these days were probably passed in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi. To the reasons there given, it may be added (1), There is no indication of a change of place: but St. Mark never omits to notice our Lord's arrival at, or departure from, any place; he has a regular formula for both "He came to," "He went forth," cf. chh. i. 14, 21, 35; ii. 1, 13; iii. 7; iv. 35; v. 1; vi. 1, 32, 53; vii. 24, 31; viii. 10, 13, 22, 27. The beginning of the journey to this district is distinctly marked in ch. viii. 27, the termination in ch. ix. 30. (2.) The space of six days for the sojourn is not more than might be expected, considering the special object of our Lord's journey (see note on viii. 27), and the novelty and paramount importance of the truths which He there prepared the minds of His disciples to receive.

There is, therefore, little room for doubt as to the scene of the Transfiguration: Tabor being out of the question, it must have been some considerable height in the immediate vicinity. Not, however, as Dr. Thomson supposes, Mount Panium, a lower spur of the chain of heights, of which the summit would be within sight of the followers of Jesus. We read, "He *leadeth them up* (words which denote a steep and difficult ascent, such as Dr. Tristram describes in his visit to Lake Phiala) to a high mountain" (ὄρος ὑψηλόν). Which height cannot, of course, be determined; but, considering the special relation of Mount Hermon to Palestine, commanding a prospect over its whole extent, visible in its snowy splendour from every district, and bearing in mind the last view of Moses from a corresponding height over the promised land, we can scarcely

3 And his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them.

4 And there appeared unto them Elias with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus.

5 And Peter answered and said to Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias.

6 For he wist not what to say; for they were sore afraid.

7 And there was a cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him.

8 And suddenly, when they had looked round about, they saw no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves.

9 And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead.

10 And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean.

---

resist the conclusion, to which late travellers and critics have been led, that the supernatural transaction took place on one of its loftiest peaks.

*transfigured.*] Literally, "He was changed in form." This may be illustrated by Phil. ii. 6, "being in the form of God;" for the radiant form of the Transfiguration was an effulgence of the Divine glory.

3. *exceeding white.*] St. Matthew, more forcibly, "as the light;" the pure, essential light of the Godhead. See note on Habakkuk iii. 4.

*as snow.*] Possibly, as Dean Stanley suggests, a reference to the snow of Hermon; but the words are not found in the oldest MSS, and are properly omitted in late critical editions.

*no fuller on earth.*] The comparison may seem to modern ears somewhat strange; but it is just one which would have been used by Dante, who, like St. Mark, always endeavours to make his readers vividly realise objective facts. St. Mark, however, has a still higher aim; he would mark the difference between earthly and heavenly brightness. The "fuller on earth" restores material clothing to its natural whiteness: the heavenly Fuller gives perfect purity. Cf. Mal. iii. 2.

6. *For he wist not.*] St. Luke has, "not knowing what he said." Our Evangelist adds the explanation; the words were spoken in bewilderment and great terror. Critics, therefore, are not justified in imputing to the apostle a weak or superstitious feeling, as though he held it fortunate that he and the other apostles were there to prepare tabernacles for the heavenly visitants, or that he expressed a desire to remain there, devoting his life to monastic contemplation, much less, as some have suggested, as though he were shrinking from the Cross. We have, at the most, a touch of nature: St. Peter then, as usual, seeking to give expression to his feelings in hasty outward action.

7. *that overshadowed.*] The cloud, as St. Matthew remarks, was bright; but brightness is the Divine veil. "His brightness was as the light; there was the hiding of His power." (Hab. iii. 4, where see note.)

*my beloved Son.*] St. Matthew adds, "in whom I am well pleased." So also St. Peter, in his second Epistle, ch. i. 17. It is not easy to account for the omission here.

8. Here St. Mark omits to notice the coming and touch of Jesus, recorded by St. Matthew; but he has characteristic and graphic expressions, which may suggest both. *Suddenly*, as though startled by the touch of Jesus, they *looked round about*—a word almost peculiar to St. Mark, implying searching or curious look; and at the end of the verse St. Mark adds the touching words, "with themselves:" a preparation for His great promise, "I am with you always"—not, as then, for a season only, but to the end of time.

9. *he charged them.*] The charge has been variously explained. It may be that this consolation and instruction were given for the time to those disciples who would first and most specially need it—to St. Peter, soon to be tried beyond his own power of endurance; to St. James, the first martyr among the Twelve; to St. John, whose fiery zeal needed to be purified that his love might be made perfect. But the charge was for the time only; after the Resurrection all were to learn that "the glory which followed" had been prefigured by this manifestation.

10. *And they kept, &c.*] Rather, "and they held fast the saying, questioning with themselves what is the rising from the dead?" This is peculiar to our Evangelist. St. Peter must have well remembered the anxious ques-

11 ¶ And they asked him, saying, Why say the scribes that Elias must first come?

12 And he answered and told them, Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things; and [e]how it is written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at nought.

[e] Isai. 53. 2, &c.

13 But I say unto you, That Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him.

14 ¶ [f]And when he came to *his* disciples, he saw a great multitude about them, and the scribes questioning with them.

[f] Matt. 17. 14.

15 And straightway all the people, when they beheld him, were greatly amazed, and running to *him* saluted him.

16 And he asked the scribes, What question ye [1]with them?

[1] Or, *among your-selves?*

17 And one of the multitude answered and said, Master, I have brought unto thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit;

18 And wheresoever he taketh him, he [1]teareth him: and he foameth,

[1] Or, *dasheth him.*

---

tionings, What was meant by rising from the dead? when was it to be looked for? why were they to keep the vision to themselves? questions which they did not venture to ask the Lord to answer, but discussed earnestly with one another. These thoughts, however, gave occasion to the question which then follows, somewhat abruptly without such a preparation; the meaning evidently being, if the series of events ending with the Resurrection is to take place forthwith, how then are we to understand the current interpretation of Malachi's prophecy concerning Elijah? See notes on Matt. xvii. 10, 11.

**12.** *and how it is written.*] The construction is somewhat difficult. The meaning is clearly, "Elias, when he comes, does restore all things, *i. e.* brings them into a state of preparedness for the Son; but that does not affect the prophecies concerning the Son Himself. You have still to learn the meaning of the Scriptures how it has been written," &c. The reading adopted by Tischendorf may be rendered "yet how is it written concerning the Son of Man? That He must suffer many things, and be set at naught."

**13.** *as it is written of him.*] This refers to the last word in the preceding verse. What has been written of both—the Son of man and of Elias—hath a true fulfilment: in the case of the former, soon to be accomplished; in the case of the latter, already completed.

14–27. THE HEALING AT THE FOOT OF THE MOUNTAIN.

**14.** *And when he came . . . he saw.*] Following, as usual, one set of MSS, Tischendorf and some others have here, "when they came—they saw;" and in *v.* 19, 'them' for 'him:' but the reading of the A. V. is supported by MSS of high authority, A C D and others, and by all ancient Versions.

*a great multitude, &c.*] The presence of the great multitude, and especially of the scribes, mentioned by St. Mark only, would seem to show that an interval of some duration had elapsed between the arrival of our Lord in the district and His descent from the mount. The scribes probably came from a distance, as usual, for the express purpose of watching His proceedings. He now finds them disputing with the disciples, evidently triumphing at their discomfiture.

**15.** *all the people, &c.*] This striking account is given by St. Mark alone. It has his special characteristic of vivid imagery. One word (ἐξεθαμβήθη) is peculiar to his style, expressing amazement and profound awe at our Lord's appearance, and thereby intimating a mien and bearing of more than usual majesty, yet not repellent, as in the case of Moses descending from Mount Sinai, Exod. xxxiv. 29–33; for the crowd ran towards Him at once with affectionate greeting (ἠσπάζοντο αὐτόν).

**16.** *And he asked the scribes.*] Or, "And he asked them:" so the oldest MSS and most of the ancient Versions. It is evident from the context that the question was addressed to the people who came to meet Him. Our Lord does not notice their demonstration of feeling towards Himself, but recalls them to the eager discussion in which, as it would seem, they were previously engaged, taking part with the scribes against the disciples.

**17.** *I have brought unto thee my son.*] Rather, "I brought my son unto thee." The difference between the Synoptists is simply owing to the fulness of St. Mark's account; the others omit this notice that the man brought his son, in the first place, to Jesus, but that, not finding Him, he applied to the disciples. The first symptom which he notices here is that in the accesses of disease his son lost the power of articulate utterance.

**18.** Other symptoms are then detailed:

and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to thy disciples that they should cast him out; and they could not.

19 He answereth him, and saith, O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him unto me.

20 And they brought him unto him: and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him; and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming.

21 And he asked his father, How long is it ago since this came unto him? And he said, Of a child.

22 And ofttimes it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him: but if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us.

23 Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, all things *are* possible to him that believeth.

24 And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.

25 When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, *Thou* dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him.

26 And *the spirit* cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him: and

---

the violent rending or convulsions, accompanied, as St. Luke states, ch. ix. 39, by inarticulate cries, the foaming and gnashing of teeth, and finally the drying up or wasting away. The symptoms are those of epilepsy, which the father was right in referring to a spiritual agency.

**19.** Thus too St. Matthew; but St. Mark has a slight change of expression, "bring him to me," noticeable both for its force and as referring to the father's statement in verse 17.

**20–24.** This most interesting and important passage is found in St. Mark alone.

**20.** *And they brought.*] They, for the father alone could not bear the youth in his convulsive agony.

*when he saw him.*] The word "he" refers to the youth; the sight of Jesus developes the struggle. Some critics (Weiss, Bleek, Ewald) refer "he saw" to the unclean spirit; but the senses of the youth received the impression, transmitting it to the fearful thing raging within him. Such at least seems the more natural explanation.

*wallowed.*] As the convulsion spent itself.

**21.** *And he asked his father.*] Not addressing the youth. Faith is the absolute condition of receiving aught from Christ (see note on ch. vi. 5); it was to be elicited from the father, as the child's representative. Thus the faith of the Syrophœnician woman was available for her daughter.

**22.** The first clause coincides with St. Matthew's previous account; the second shews the man's state of mind, half-trusting, half-doubting, so far as power was concerned, but appealing confidently to the compassion so often tested and never failing.

**23.** *Jesus said unto him.*] This brings out the true point. The question is not whether Jesus can act, but whether the man can believe. Unbelief is the only, but the effectual, bar even to the omnipotence of Love. Three MSS, followed by late editors, have a striking and not improbable reading, "*As to* the *word* if Thou canst—all things are possible to him who believeth:" or, "what means the word, if Thou canst?" The authority for the received text is, however, too strong to permit so serious an alteration in a passage specially impressed on the heart of Christians.

**24.** *And straightway.*] The oldest MSS omit "and," thus enhancing the force of the expression. The conviction, though imperfect or undeveloped, was instantaneous; the word went straight to the heart; the answer came straightway. Few words have been more frequently repeated by suppliants: they express the deepest, most prominent, and most poignant feeling in every stage of faith, conscious, above all things, of its own weakness.

*with tears.*] These words are omitted in the oldest MSS, and some Versions.

**25.** *the people came running together.*] This notice implies that, as was His wont (see above, vii. 33; viii. 23), Jesus had taken the man apart when thus questioning him. Now the word of command was to be heard by all: it is singularly strong, "I—emphatically—even I command" thee. "Go out"—"come in no more."

**26.** *rent him sore.*] This last convulsion is not recorded by the other Synoptists. The omission in St. Matthew may have been

he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead.

27 But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose.

28 And when he was come into the house, his disciples asked him privately, Why could not we cast him out?

29 And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting.

30 ¶ [g] And they departed thence, and passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know *it*.

[g] Matt. 17. 22.

31 For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day.

32 But they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him.

---

simply for the sake of brevity, as is usual with that Evangelist; but we might have expected to find it in St. Luke, and it supplies one argument, among many, that he had not this gospel before him when he wrote. It is unquestionably true to nature, shewing that the expulsion of a formidable evil from our spiritual being is not effected without a terrible struggle, followed, in some cases, by extreme prostration (cf. Gregory the Great, quoted by Trench, 'Miracles,' p. 367). The effect remained until it was removed by personal contact; when Jesus took the youth by the hand, he arose, as it were, from the dead.

Archbishop Trench, who does full justice to the masterly style of St. Mark's description, quotes a very curious passage from Lucian, 'Philopseudes,' c. xvi., containing an ironical allusion to this miracle, and evidently to St. Mark's narrative:—"All know the Syrian of Palestine, the skilful impostor in such matters: how many he has taken in hand, prostrated to the moon (*i. e.* lunatics), with distorted eyes and foaming mouths, and raises them up, and sends them away whole, delivering them of the terrible inflictions for a great price" (see Trench, 'Miracles,' p. 363 note). The passage is important, for many reasons. It is a very early attestation to the general reception of this gospel; it shews how widely spread was some belief in our Lord's miraculous power; and it is a good illustration of the usual process by which men of the world and the philosophers of the day satisfied their own minds concerning it.

**28.** *into the house.*] Rather, "into a house:" "the house" would imply habitual residence; "a house" shews that during His sojourn in the district—as we find in similar cases—one was at His disposal. But St. Mark's object is simply to point out that the inquiry of the disciples was in private, as usual, after the departure of the crowd.

**29.** *and fasting.*] These words are omitted in the two oldest MSS, but are retained in all the others, and by the ancient Versions. Tischendorf, followed by Weiss, omits the whole of verse 21 in Matt. xvii. as an interpolation from this gospel. Such alterations of the text are not justifiable where the few MSS, to which almost exclusive authority is attached by those critics, are not supported by independent witnesses.

30–32. The Return to Galilee, with Instruction by the Way.

**30.** *and passed through Galilee.*] Or, "and were passing along through Galilee." The meaning is, that our Lord, with His disciples, then left the district of Cæsarea Philippi, and on their journey passed through Upper Galilee. They probably crossed the Upper Jordan by the bridge or ford called Binat Jacob, below Lake Huleh, and thence followed the route to Capernaum.

*and he would not.*] The reason is given in the next verse. Our Lord would prevent a concourse of people—not, as some hold, because He was now in the territory of Herod Antipas, but because the disciples needed further instruction, specially concerning His death. St. Matthew's account is less full, but agrees with this. He says, "while they abode in Galilee," *i. e.* were no longer in the district of Cæsarea Philippi.

**32.** This verse gives additional information. St. Matthew notices the deep sorrow of the disciples; St. Mark says that they still failed to understand the saying. He uses the imperfect tense throughout, denoting the continued or repeated result of His teaching. If the disciples understood what was meant by suffering and death, they could not reconcile it with what they knew of His Person, and were probably at an utter loss as to the sense in which He was to rise again: whether it implied entrance into a higher state, or restoration to common life. The narrator evidently feels that the fear to inquire, though natural and evincing reverence, was detrimental to them, shewing an imperfect appreciation of His character and of their duty.

[a] Matt. 18. 1.

33 ¶ [a]And he came to Capernaum: and being in the house he asked them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way?

34 But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who *should be* the greatest.

35 And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, If any man desire to be first, *the same* shall be last of all, and servant of all.

36 And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them,

37 Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

38 ¶ [a]And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us.

[a] Luke 9. 49.

---

33–37. THE GREAT LESSON OF HUMILITY AND BROTHERLY LOVE.

**33.** *What was it that ye disputed.*] This question draws out the fact, not recorded by St. Matthew, that after the failure of the disciples to understand their Master's prediction, while they were journeying towards Capernaum, they were privately discussing their own relative position. This proves how thoroughly they realised His Messianic calling and the nearness of His kingdom, but, at the same time, how far they were from understanding the conditions on which they were to be admitted into it. Their silence and confusion speak of an awakening of conscience. St. Matthew represents them as spontaneously coming forward and asking the question; less accurately, as it would seem, but, as usual, fixing attention exclusively on the main point—the ambition and jealousy which called for rebuke: see, however, note on Matt. xviii. 1.

**35.** *And he sat down.*] The lesson, which touched the fundamental principle of the Christian life, was impressed formally and with all solemnity. Our Lord took His seat at once, as Teacher, as Lord of the house, and as Judge, and addressed the Twelve, as the representatives of the Church.

**36.** *he took a child.*] Thus the other Evangelists. St. Mark alone notices the affectionate embrace, taking the child in His arms (ἐναγκαλισάμενος), a very graphic word. Was the child St. Peter's? It was probably in his house that this took place, and his wife and children would be near (see note on ch. i. 30). St. Matthew notices that He called a child to Him, as though it were standing by. The tradition concerning Ignatius is noticed in the note on St. Matthew xviii. 2.

**37.** *not me.*] That is, not Me only—a common Hebrew idiom. St. Matthew, having recorded this saying previously (ch. x. 40), does not repeat it here; but on this occasion there was a special fitness in the reference to His own position as sent by the Father. He was giving a lesson of subordination.

Few lessons have made a deeper impression upon the heart of Christians; few have been so imperfectly applied. Still it has been applied to an extent which has forced men to recognise humility and tenderness to the weak as specially characteristic of Christianity, most conspicuous in greatest saints.

38–42. THE QUESTION OF ST. JOHN.

**38.** *And John answered him.*] So St. Luke. Here the oldest MSS have simply "John said," omitting the conjunction; but the words "in Thy name" were evidently suggested by our Lord's saying, "in My name," verse 37. It seems to have recalled to the Apostles' minds what had occurred previously; not, however, on the way—for none but the disciples were then with the Lord—but either in the district which they had just left, or at an earlier time in the course of their independent mission (ch. vi. 7–13). What perplexed St. John was, that one not belonging to the immediate followers of Jesus should have wrought precisely the miracle which stood foremost among the signs of apostleship; that which the disciples themselves had so lately attempted, but failed to work (see verses 18, 23). The fact is of great importance, as shewing that our Lord's teaching and influence had worked so powerfully that some, not counted among His followers, had not only true faith, but the strong faith which brings with it mastery over the spiritual foes of man. There is no reason to think that the act was done in a wrong spirit, as in the case of Jewish exorcists (Acts xix. 13). Even Hilgenfeld regards this as a mark of the independence of St. Mark's gospel. (See 'Einl.' p. 516.)

*we forbad him.*] Or "hindered him." The MSS vary; the oldest have the imperfect tense, which would imply only that the

39 But Jesus said, Forbid him not: [b]for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me.

[b] 1 Cor. 12. 3.

40 For he that is not against us is on our part.

41 [c]For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward.

[c] Matt. 10. 42.

42 [d]And whosoever shall offend one of *these* little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea.

[d] Matt. 18. 6.

43 [e]And if thy hand [1]offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched:

[e] Matt. 5. 29. & 18. 8.

[1] Or, *cause thee to offend.*

44 [f]Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

[f] Isai. 66. 24.

45 And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched:

46 Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

47 And if thine eye [1]offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire:

[1] Or, *cause thee to offend.*

---

prohibition was given; others have the aorist, which would declare that it was effectual.

**39.** *Forbid him not.*] A general precept. No one is to be hindered who works in Christ's name and in good faith.

*for there is no man.*] This clause is not in St. Luke's gospel. It enforces the truth that a faith which enables a man to do a good work in the name of Jesus will generally be accompanied with the grace of love. Our Lord does not state this as universally true. He says, "will not lightly" or "quickly" (ταχύ) speak evil—not so long as the faith is honest and pure.

**41.** *whosoever shall give, &c.*] (See Matt. x. 42.) Here our Lord extends the application of the principle to all acts of Christian sympathy and charity. The least act of kindness done in Christ's name will be rewarded. The disciples are taught that no Christian man may explain away beneficent acts, or suggest a bad motive for them. The reading of the A. V. is probably correct. It stands on good authority, and is accepted by Tischendorf. The word *my* is omitted by other late editors; the meaning in that case would be "in the name, or for the reason that ye are Christians." The oldest MSS and Versions are divided.

**42.** *And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones.*] This is immediately connected with the preceding verse. With the good act is contrasted the evil act. The least act of love will be rewarded; any act which offends Christ's little ones, that is, causes any of His followers to swerve from the right way, involves deadly sin. The word "offence" occurs very frequently, and in various applications. Here the context shews that breaches of Christian charity are specially meant; they were then besetting temptations for the disciples, and have been fertile and permanent causes of schisms and divisions in the Church.

43–50. THE LAST TERRIBLE WARNINGS, BRINGING TO A CLOSE OUR LORD'S WHOLE COURSE OF TEACHING IN GALILEE.

**43–48.** These verses coincide with St. Matthew's account (on which see notes), but are more detailed; at once more rhythmical and more pointed, with an emphatic threefold reiteration and a most solemn close. We have, no doubt, the very form, as well as substance, of our Lord's utterance.

**43.** The *hand* represents all acts of which the hand is an instrument; considering the special occasion of the warning, and the concluding words in verse 50, acts of violence may be specially referred to.

*into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched.*] Literally, "into the Gehenna, into the fire which is unquenchable." St. Matthew has "the fire which is eternal." St. Mark's words remove any doubt as to the meaning of "eternal." So far as our own nature is concerned, and our knowledge extends, the effects of unrepented sin are eternal; the torment is unchangeable. See note on verse 49.

**44.** *Where their worm dieth not.*] Literally, "endeth not:" a fearful commentary on "eternal" (αἰώνιος), making it equivalent to unending (ἀτελεύτητος). The "worm" represents the subjective anguish of remorse, unending so long as memory remains, and is burdened with the consciousness of unpardonable sin. The fire is the action of Divine wrath: in fact, the Presence of God, revealed as a "consuming fire" to the lost. On the reading, see Note at end of chapter.

48 Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

49 For every one shall be salted with fire, [g] and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.

[g] Lev. 2. 13.

50 [h] Salt *is* good: but if the salt have lost his saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another.

[h] Matt. 5. 13.

---

**49-50.** This is confessedly one of the most difficult passages in the Gospel. We have to ascertain the literal meaning of the words and their mutual bearings.

**49.** *For every one shall be salted with fire.*] "Every one" is best explained by referring it to the word "their" (αὐτῶν) in the preceding clause. Since it cannot be taken universally in any sense, its limitation must be determined by the context: "every one (of them, *i.e.* the lost) will be (rather than 'shall be') salted with fire." The expression "will be salted with fire" implies that salt and fire are alike in some essential characteristic and operation. Salt preserves flesh, preventing disintegration; the obvious inference is that the quality or efficacy of the unquenchable fire may be analogous, not destroying or consuming, but preserving from dissolution. This cannot apply to natural fire; but it may, and here most probably does, apply to spiritual fire acting upon the consciousness of the lost. The anguish of a tortured conscience, of remorse in the thoroughly awakened spirit, must needs be commensurate in duration, if not with the existence of the soul, yet with its continuance in the same moral condition. As long as the past is remembered and the struggle against God's will lasts, the torment will endure, quickening instead of destroying. The Anglo-Saxon expresses this very forcibly by the word "cvic-susl"—living torture.

Jablonski has an interesting treatise, shewing that the word "salt" is frequently applied to substances, such as pitch or asphalt, which resemble salt as preserving from corruption; but the reference would not present itself to the minds of St. Mark's readers, and seems to be excluded by the next clause. See Jablonski, 'Opuscula, ed. Te Water,' tom. ii. p. 459, ff.

*and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.*] On the reading see Note below. Here the word "sacrifice" is evidently the antithesis to "the lost," understood in the preceding clause; and "salt" is the antithesis to "fire." Salted must be taken in the same or an analogous sense in both clauses—preserved from corruption: perhaps also with the further sense, as suggested by Meyer, of being kept, or brought into a state fitted for contact with the Divine Being.

We have therefore, first, a being or person consecrated to God an acceptable offering, *i. e.* a Christian, as such, "a reasonable sacrifice" (λογικὴ θυσία): this meaning is fully borne out by the usage of the New Testament, see specially Rom. xii. 1, and is accepted by Meyer and other critics. We have, secondly, a principle or power by which the offering is made acceptable: grace must, therefore, be meant, either generally, or in a special mode of operation; and, if so, evidently in the mode indicated throughout this passage, *i. e.* brotherly love, peace among brethren (see verse 50), charity, the very bond of peace, and of all virtues. It is the salt of life—of all life, social and spiritual; it keeps the soul quick, vigorous, acceptable to God, and keeps brotherly union unbroken. It is the salt of the New Covenant, thus exactly analogous to the salt of sacrifice (מלח הברית) in the Old, which is called "salt of the covenant of thy God" (Lev. ii. 13).

**50.** *Salt is good.*] Or, "good is the salt," sc. the salt used for sacrifice: good, in the literal sense, as a material thing; good in the highest sense, as a spiritual influence. If natural salt be spoiled, it ceases, properly speaking, to be salt; after undergoing a process of chemical decomposition, it cannot be turned to any use or restored to its pristine state. If spiritual salt be corrupted, love be perverted into envy, emulation, outbreaks of selfishness, from which it was specially intended to preserve the soul, nothing can replace it; nothing can preserve the unloving soul from destruction, or restore that harmonious co-ordination of all members which preserves a religious community from dissolution.

*Have salt in yourselves.*] Have this principle each in your own hearts, and, as you then will be able, have peace one with another.

This exegesis keeps close to the text; it introduces no extraneous thought, and it harmonises thoroughly with the account of the transactions which give occasion to the utterance.

Meyer winds up his exposition—the least satisfactory in this part of his work—with a suggestion that we have here an imperfect account of some lost discourse of our Saviour.

It seems not to have been sufficiently remarked that this discourse forms a most solemn and fitting close of our Lord's whole

work in Galilee. On this occasion He condemns, in the most emphatic terms, the feelings in which lies the greatest danger for the Church in all ages, and sets forth the true central principle of its existence, presenting with greater distinctness than ever the alternatives of eternal life and eternal fire. His last word is, "Have peace one with another."

Such is the close of the work in Galilee, presenting to the Church a transfigured Lord, a crucified Saviour, the Prince of Peace.

NOTES on verses 44, 49.

44. Tischendorf and Weiss omit the verse in this place, following ℵ B C L Δ, a few old MSS of the Italic, the Coptic, and the Armenian Versions. The majority of uncial, and nearly all cursive, MSS have it. Augustine expressly notes the threefold iteration, "non enim piguit uno loco ter eadem dicere."

The question is, whether omission or interpolation is more probable. The MSS to which modern critics attach most importance are conspicuous for omissions; in this case they are not supported by the Syriac or by the best MSS of the Italic Version.

49. *and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.*] This clause is omitted by Tischendorf in his last edition, on the authority of ℵ B L Δ, and eleven cursive MSS. It is extant in nine uncial MSS, including A C and D, independent witnesses; in the great majority of cursive MSS; in most of the ancient Versions, old Italic, Vulgate, Coptic (Wilkins, and Schwartze), Syriac, Gothic, and Ethiopian; and it was retained by Lachmann and by Tischendorf himself in all previous editions. As presenting a real difficulty for the exegesis, it was scarcely likely to be interpolated, unless it were, as Schulz suggested, a gloss upon the word ἁλισθήσεται, from Lev. ii. 13, which seems far from probable. Rightly understood, it suits the context and adds force to the argument.

## CHAPTER X.

2 *Christ disputeth with the Pharisees touching divorcement:* 13 *blesseth the children that are brought unto him:* 17 *resolveth a rich man how he may inherit life everlasting:* 23 *telleth his disciples of the danger of riches:* 28 *promiseth rewards to them that forsake any thing for the gospel:* 32 *foretelleth his death and resurrection:* 35 *biddeth the two ambitious suitors to think rather of suffering with him:* 46 *and restoreth to Bartimæus his sight.*

AND [a] he arose from thence, and cometh into the coasts of Judæa by the farther side of Jordan: and the people resort unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again.

[a] Matt. 19. 1.

2 ¶ And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away *his* wife? tempting him.

### Chap. X.—1. The Departure from Galilee, and Arrival in Peræa.

1. *And he arose ... Jordan.*] On the order of events see Dean Mansel's notes at the end of Matt. xviii. and on xix. 1. According to the received reading, which is followed by A. V., the agreement between St. Matthew and St. Mark is complete, though St. Mark, as usual, is rather more explicit. Both, however, omit all notice of the course pursued by our Lord between His departure from Galilee and His arrival at the place, not mentioned by name, beyond the Jordan, where He recommenced His public teaching. This agreement is not materially affected by the other reading, adopted by the generality of modern critics. Instead of "by the farther side of Jordan," the oldest MSS and Versions have, "and beyond the Jordan." In either case we have, first, the final departure from Galilee, a journey through Peræa of uncertain duration, and the arrival at the borders of Judæa. From St. Luke's gospel, it appears that in the beginning of the journey He touched the frontier of Samaria, and that between His departure from Galilee and arrival at Jericho several incidents occurred, of which no record is found in the other Evangelists. See note on Luke ix. 51.

*and the people resort unto him again.*] Or, **and multitudes come together again unto Him.** It is evident from this statement that the rumour of His arrival drew together great numbers from the adjoining district to the north-east of Judea, proving that He was already well known in that part of Palestine, and incidentally corroborating St. John's accounts of previous visits to Jerusalem. On this occasion He comes forward once more as a public Teacher. St. Mark's account is very distinct; according to His custom on former occasions He was teaching

3 And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you?

4 And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put *her* away.

5 And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept.

6 But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.

7 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife;

8 And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.

9 What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

10 And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same *matter*.

11 And he saith unto them, [k] Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.

[k] Matt. 5. 32. & 19. 9.

12 And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

13 ¶ [l] And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and *his* disciples rebuked those that brought *them*.

[l] Matt. 19. 13.

14 But when Jesus saw *it*, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.

15 Verily I say unto you, Whoso-

---

there again, *i. e.* after a suspension of public ministrations. St. Matthew (xix. 2) notices the healings only.

2–12. On Divorce.

**2.** *And the Pharisees.*] The recommencement of our Lord's public teaching at once brought the Pharisees into conflict with Him. The question which they proposed was intended to test His position with reference to the leading schools of Judea. At that time there was a hot contest between the followers of Shammai and Hillel. The former allowed divorce, but only in cases of moral defilement; the latter, by far the more influential teacher, left it altogether to the husband's will. It might be declared on the slightest grounds, some of which were afterwards specified by Rabbi Akiba. Such, indeed, was the common practice: Josephus put away his wife, mother of his three children, "not liking her ways" (see the last chapter of his Life). The subject is discussed by Dean Mansel on St. Matthew, and lately by Achelis, 'Bergpredigt,' pp. 137–139. The decision of our Lord must have taken the Pharisees by surprise, nor would they know how to deal with it: it appealed to a religious principle which could not be gainsaid.

*to put away his wife.*] St. Mark omits "for every cause," Matt. xix. 3; his readers would not understand the allusion to a technical term current in the Rabbinical schools.

**10.** *And in the house.*] This implies that our Lord was sojourning at the place, having a temporary residence. The teaching had been in public; but the disciples, needing further instruction on a difficult point, consulted Him, as usual, privately, at the close of the day. This might be inferred from St. Matthew's account, who, in verse 8, has "he saith unto them, *i. e.* the people;" in verse 9, "I say unto you."

**11.** St. Mark omits the exception "in the case of adultery," twice recorded by St. Matthew (v. 32 and xix. 9, where see notes), either as being well known, or as not bearing directly upon the question of the disciples.

**12.** *And if a woman.*] This is the counterpart of the words in St. Matthew. The man who marries a divorced woman commits adultery; so does the divorced woman who marries again. In addition to what has been written by Dean Mansel on St. Matthew, *l. c.*, it must be observed that there is neither here nor elsewhere in the Holy Scriptures any intimation that a man separated from an adulterous wife, who is dead to him, incurs blame for remarriage; the penalty falls on the evil-doer.

13–16. The Blessing of Children.

This account has a few, but very striking, words in addition to those of the other Synoptists.

**13.** *they brought.*] This touching scene most probably occurred in the same house; the parents would naturally bring their children to Jesus for His blessing. Cf. note on ch. ix. 36.

**14.** *was much displeased.*] St. Mark uses a strong word, implying indignant anger.

*and forbid them not.*] Omit the word "and." St. Mark, as usual, has the more lively form, giving the words in quick succes-

ever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.

16 And he took them up in his arms, put *his* hands upon them, and blessed them.

m Matt. 19. 16.

17 ¶ m And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?

18 And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is* none good but one, *that is*, God.

19 Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother.

20 And he answered and said unto him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth.

21 Then Jesus beholding him, loved him, and said unto him, One

---

sion: "let them come unto me; hinder them not." So Tischendorf, Weiss, McClellan, &c.

**15.** St. Matthew has this saying on another occasion, ch. xviii. 3. Our Lord doubtless recalled it to the mind of His disciples, already forgetful of the lesson so lately given; cf. ch. ix. 36, 37.

**16.** These details are peculiar to St. Mark—the embracing, the blessing, and the emphatic close.

The application to infant-baptism made by our Church is questioned by some critics. But the argument is clear and conclusive; if children are capable of receiving a blessing, they must be fit recipients of that which is signified and conveyed in Baptism.

17–27. THE RICH YOUNG MAN.

**17.** *And when he was gone forth.*] Rather, "and when He was **going** forth." The young man came just as our Lord was leaving the house, where He had passed the night. St. Mark alone notices this sign of earnestness: "they who seek Me early shall find Me." Thus, too, we owe to St. Mark the fact that "he came running, and fell on his knees; both important, as showing zeal and reverence, a recognition of Jesus, if not as the Christ—which is not stated—yet as a Teacher specially empowered to shew the way to eternal life.

*inherit.*] So too St. Luke; St. Matthew has "that I may have." "Inherit" is more special, implying "that I may be among those who are true children, and, as such, lawful inheritors of the kingdom."

**18.** *Why callest thou me good?*] The question is undoubtedly intended to probe the depth of the young man's faith. Nothing but a recognition of the Divinity of Christ could justify the expression used by him, if it were taken in its highest and absolute sense. As a conventional form, or even as a genuine expression of reverence, our Lord will not permit it to be applied to Himself, regarded in the light of a merely human Teacher. Words without meaning, or with a meaning only partially true, are rejected by Him who is "the Truth." It is, therefore, evident that this statement leads onward to the truth afterwards fully revealed—that, since all goodness proceeds from God only, and exists in Him alone, pure and absolute, the epithet "good" being rightly applied to the Son necessarily involves His oneness in Essence with the Father. This text, however, is not a declaration of that doctrine, but a preparation for it, and, as such, peculiarly suitable to this critical point in our Lord's career.

**19.** St. Matthew here is rather fuller. He begins in verse 17 (ch. xix.) with a direct answer to the young man's first question, records a second question, and adds in verse 19 "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," the words in which St. Paul sums up the substantial import of the law (Rom. xiii. 9). Thus again, in verse 20, St. Matthew adds, "What lack I yet?" The differences in the two gospels are characteristic: our Evangelist is more graphic and minute in relating the circumstances, St. Matthew more exact in recording the words. The passage is strongly opposed to the theory that either copied from the other. The details were probably added to the original tradition by St. Peter, who must have watched with special interest the young man so like himself in impulsive temperament; an interest shared certainly by St. Mark, remembering the singular resemblance to his own conduct when he left Paul and Barnabas. See also note on ch. xiv. 51.

**21.** *Then Jesus beholding him.*] Rather, "looking at him;" an earnest, searching look is intimated. Our Lord looked into the young man's heart, and saw there somewhat which elicited love: a peculiarly interesting fact, as indicating Divine insight blended with natural human feeling. That love explains the following command, which might otherwise have an aspect of sternness. It was no

thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me.

22 And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions.

23 ¶ And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!

24 And the disciples were astonished at his words But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!

25 It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.

26 And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved?

27 And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men *it is* impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible.

28 ¶ [a] Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee.

[a] Matt. 27.

29 And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's,

30 But he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and

---

general command, applicable to all who would be disciples of Christ, but a special call to be thenceforth enrolled among His personal followers.

*take up the cross*, cf. viii. 34. These words are omitted in most of the oldest MSS, including C D.

**22.** *he was sad.*] The expression used by St. Mark implies a gloom overclouding the countenance, like the sky darkened at the approach of a sudden storm. This passage is often referred to in very early writings, by Justin Martyr, in the Clementines, and in the writings of heretics, the Marcosians, Ptolemæans, and the Valentinians (see Irenæus, I. 8. 3; I. 20. 2.) The Gospel of the Hebrews has an addition, shewing how seriously that document had been corrupted in the time of Origen by the bad taste of the Ebionites; cf. Orig. tom. iii. p. 671 B.

**23.** *looked round about.*] The expression usually employed by St. Mark on similar occasions.

**24.** *were astonished.*] A word denoting utter bewilderment, seldom used by other writers in the N. T. This verse is much fuller than those which correspond to it in St. Matthew and St. Luke.

*Children.*] Note the affectionate address, tempering the severity of the declaration.

*for them that trust in riches.*] These words are found in the great majority of MSS and of ancient Versions, and, whether expressed or understood, are certainly needed, as interpreting our Lord's statement. They are, however, omitted by Tischendorf, Weiss, and McClellan, following the two oldest and one other MSS, and one copy of the Coptic Version. Possibly, they may have been inserted as a gloss; but it seems hazardous to reject them without the authority of independent witnesses.

**26.** *among themselves.*] Not, therefore, openly; but their hearts were open to the Heart-searcher. Tischendorf here judiciously deserts his usual authorities, which have "to Him" for "among themselves."

28–31. THE REWARD OF SELF-SACRIFICE.

**28.** *have followed thee.*] St. Mark omits the words, "What shall we have, therefore?" (Matt. xix. 27.) They might seem to imply culpable ambition or selfishness, but our Lord's answer proves simply that the feelings which dictated them needed a check and warning. The promise is general. Every Christian will receive far more than he gives up; he will have dearer ties than the natural ties, possessions more precious than earth can supply—both rewards stated most fully by St. Mark—but on the condition of sharing his Master's earthly trials; *with persecutions*, a word recorded by St. Mark only—a most important one, shewing how repeatedly our Lord prepared His disciples for the tribulations which awaited them.

St. Mark omits the great promise to the Twelve, recorded by St. Matthew, xix. 28. It would be scarcely intelligible to Romans, or might have seemed to them applicable to the future condition of Hebrew Christians. St. Luke, also, writing specially for Gentiles, leaves it unnoticed.

brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life.

31 [a] But many *that are* first shall be last; and the last first.

[a] Matt. 19. 30.

32 ¶ [b] And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them what things should happen unto him,

[b] Matt. 20. 17.

33 *Saying*, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles:

34 And they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him: and the third day he shall rise again.

35 ¶ [c] And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire.

[c] Matt. 20. 20.

36 And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you?

37 They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory.

38 But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?

---

### 32–34. Further Prediction of Sufferings on the Way to Jerusalem.

**32.** *And they were in the way...afraid.*] This verse may be rendered according to the oldest MSS, "And they were on the way going up to Jerusalem: and Jesus **was going** before them; and they were **astonished** (as in verse 24): and **those who were following** were afraid." The extreme amazement (St. Mark uses the same word elsewhere in describing utter bewilderment, cf. ch. i. 27) of the disciples is accounted for by their feeling that the last crisis was now near at hand; but there is evidently a reference to the paragraph immediately preceding, in which it is distinctly announced that persecution would be the lot of all true disciples, verse 30; and a warning is given seriously affecting those who were foremost among them, verse 31. The amazement is attributed only to the Twelve; the fear was shared by all who then followed our Lord on His last journey.

*And he took again the twelve.*] Calling them apart, as on other occasions, in order to give them more special instruction. The expression "He began to tell them" refers to the announcement not only that He would suffer death, but that the journey then commenced would have that termination.

**34.** *and shall kill him.*] Both St. Mark and St. Luke omit the word "crucify," which St. Matthew retains, with his usual accuracy in recording our Lord's words. The Cross had previously been intimated (see ch. viii. 34), but not distinctly pointed out as the mode of His death.

### 35–45. The Application of the Sons of Zebedee, and the Rivalry among the Disciples.

**35.** *And James and John.*] This application was made immediately after the announcement of the cruel and ignominious death of our Lord and of His resurrection: a point often overlooked in judging the character of the two brothers, who thus shewed devoted zeal and strong faith, though with an alloy of personal feeling which called for repression. St. Mark omits to notice the intervention of Salome; see note on Matt. xx. 20.

*we would that thou shouldest do.*] Or "we wish." This request and the following answer are implied, but not related, by St. Matthew. Our Evangelist is especially intent upon the indications of unhealthy feelings of rivalry among the Apostles.

**38.** *the baptism that I am baptized with.*] This is omitted by the oldest MSS in Matt. xx. 22. Though identical in general meaning with the previous clause, it has a special significance: the baptism was that of blood, through which our Lord passed into the state of glory, followed by His true disciples. The first question was, whether they had the courage required to go with Him through sufferings and death. There may be an allusion in v. 39 to the death of St. James and the protracted trials of St. John, but scarcely to any special suffering of the latter; whether or not any weight is to be attached to the very ancient account of his near approach to martyrdom at the Porta Latina, which M. Renan, rather unexpectedly, holds to be probable, see 'Antechrist,' pp. 197–199.

39 And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized:

40 But to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared.

41 But when the ten heard *it*, they began to be much displeased with James and John.

42 But Jesus called them *to him*, and saith unto them, [d] Ye know that they which [1] are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them.

[d] Luke 22. 25.
[1] Or, *think good.*

43 But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister:

44 And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all.

45 For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

46 ¶ [e] And they came to Jericho: and as he went out of Jericho with his disciples and a great number of people, blind Bartimæus, the son of Timæus, sat by the way side begging.

[e] Matt. 20. 29.

47 And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, *thou* son of David, have mercy on me.

48 And many charged him that he should hold his peace: but he cried the more a great deal, *Thou* son of David, have mercy on me.

49 And Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be called. And they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good comfort, rise; he calleth thee.

50 And he, casting away his garment, rose, and came to Jesus.

51 And Jesus answered and said unto him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I might receive my sight.

---

40. *but it shall be given to them.*] Or, omitting these words, "save to them for whom it is prepared." See note on Matt. xx. 23.

42. *which are accounted to rule.*] The expression is peculiar, meaning, probably, "who are regarded as rulers," and as such exercise dominion; by some critics the words are understood to imply pretension rather than right.

46–52. THE JOURNEY THROUGH JERICHO.

The narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark agree, with some slight divergences in detail. Both pass over the reception of our Lord in Jericho, which is circumstantially related by St. Luke, who differs also from them in representing the healing of the blind man as taking place before the entrance into the city. St. Matthew, however, mentions two blind men, ch. xx. 30, where see note.

46. *they came to Jericho.*] The entrance is not noticed by St. Matthew.

*Bartimæus.*] *I. e.*, as St. Mark explains it, son of Timæus. It may be inferred that the person so designated was known to St. Mark's readers, being from that time, as is implied in verse 52, a follower of Christ, and possibly a missionary.

47. *Jesus of Nazareth.*] A designation never used by the Evangelist, save in recording the words of others, see ch. i. 24. The people of Jericho would naturally refer to our Lord's original dwelling-place; but the blind man appealed to Him at once as the Son of David (this designation also occurring here for the first time in St. Mark's gospel, see note on ch. i. 1), thus recognising Him as the Messiah.

49, 50. The command to the disciples, their kindly, sympathising words, and the sudden energetic action of the blind man, are related with a vividness and fulness characteristic of this gospel. St. Peter naturally recalled them, not, it may be, without reference to his own act, described by St. John, ch. xxi. 7. The originality and independence of this narrative are recognised by late critical writers.

*rose.*] Or, according to most of the older MSS, **leapt up**: cf. Acts iii. 6, where a different word with the same meaning is used in the Greek.

51. *Lord.*] The word used by Bartimæus is Rabbuni, *i. e.* Master and Teacher; cf. John xx. 16.

52 And Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy faith hath [1]made thee whole. And immediately he received his sight, and followed Jesus in the way.

[1] Or, *saved thee.*

## CHAPTER XI.

1 *Christ rideth with triumph into Jerusalem: 12 curseth the fruitless leafy tree: 15 purgeth the temple: 20 exhorteth his disciples to stedfastness of faith, and to forgive their enemies: 27 and defendeth the lawfulness of his actions, by the witness of John, who was a man sent of God.*

AND [f]when they came nigh to Jerusalem, unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, he sendeth forth two of his disciples,

[f] Matt. 21. 1.

2 And saith unto them, Go your way into the village over against you: and as soon as ye be entered into it, ye shall find a colt tied, whereon never man sat; loose him, and bring *him*.

3 And if any man say unto you, Why do ye this? say ye that the

---

CHAP. XI.—1–11. THE ENTRANCE INTO JERUSALEM.

From this point the three Synoptical Gospels coincide substantially up to the morning of the Resurrection; the few and unimportant differences consist either in characteristics of style, such as have previously been remarked, or in facts and words related more or less fully by each.

1. *when they came nigh to Jerusalem.*] The journey from Jericho to Jerusalem occupies about seven hours, at the usual rate of travelling. It is laborious and trying. After a slow ascent of some miles the road crosses the wild desolate heights of the Quarantana, through rugged passes fearfully hot at the season of Easter and usually haunted by robbers, the scene of the parable of the Good Samaritan (cf. Luke x. 30), and, according to tradition, of our Lord's temptation. An inn or caravanserai, about midway, offers at present some repose, but no refreshment. On the height overhanging the descent to Bethany, the view of Jerusalem—by far the grandest—opens upon the traveller from the east. There our Lord looked down on the Temple, and the whole extent of the "city of the Great King;" there, for the first time, He took the decisive step of publicly announcing Himself as the Messiah by preparations for a formal entrance, like one of the kings of old, in peaceful guise, riding upon an ass, and attended by a vast multitude, now fully recognising and loudly proclaiming His true rank.

Modern criticism ventures to speculate upon the feelings by which our Lord was then actuated. Keim, one of the latest and ablest exponents of rationalistic views, holds that He was elated, filled with new hopes, expecting that He would now be accepted by the nation as the Messiah; not, however, as relying upon the multitude of the followers, but upon a change of feelings in the people and their leaders, wrought by the intervention of God. No ground for this assumption is found in the sacred Records. In the last discourse to His disciples (ch. x. 31–34) our Lord had foretold, fully and distinctly, the fatal issue of this journey, and not a word had been afterwards uttered of a contrary import. Keim arbitrarily rejects the discourses in St. Luke's gospel, which fully accord with that prediction; but he can adduce no saying which proves or indicates that Jesus shared the excitement of His followers. He was completing His own work; the time was come when He was to meet the fate reserved for the Christ. From first to last He acted and spoke as one who had the rights of a King, but who, in asserting them, was fully aware that He would thereby insure His condemnation and death.

On the date of the arrival at Jerusalem, see note on Matt. xxi. 1: it must have been late in the afternoon of Sunday.

*Bethphage and Bethany.*] Thus, too, St. Luke; St. Matthew has Bethphage only. In this passage the readings differ. Some MSS omit Bethphage, others Bethany, but both are well supported. Bethphage, "House of Figs," is often mentioned in the Talmud, and, being well known, is probably named here in order to determine the site of Bethany, of which no ancient notice is found except in the Gospel history. From comparing the various passages in which these names occur, it would seem that Bethphage was a term applied to a district of some extent to the east of Jerusalem, and that Bethany was situate on its western border. The question is discussed by Caspari, 'Leben Jesu,' p. 162, who suggests that Bethany (which he renders "House of Booths," *Bethchanioth*) may have been the place where travellers attending the festivals set up their booths or tents: but the derivation of the word and the usage are uncertain.

2. *whereon never man sat.*] So too St. Luke. The notice is important. Animals which had not previously been used were alone admissible for sacred purposes, cf. Num. xix. 2; Deut. xxi. 3; 1 Sam. vi. 7.

Lord hath need of him; and straightway he will send him hither.

4 And they went their way, and found the colt tied by the door without in a place where two ways met; and they loose him.

5 And certain of them that stood there said unto them, What do ye, loosing the colt?

6 And they said unto them even as Jesus had commanded: and they let them go.

7 And they brought the colt to Jesus, and cast their garments on him; and he sat upon him.

8 And many spread their garments in the way: and others cut down branches off the trees, and strawed *them* in the way.

9 And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna; Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord:

10 Blessed *be* the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest.

11 And Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the temple: and when he had looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve.

12 ¶ And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, he was hungry:

13 [c] And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not *yet*.

[c] Matt. 21. 19.

---

3. *he will send him hither.*] Late editors, following the oldest MSS, add the word *again*. I.e. the disciples are to promise that the ass will be restored to the owner. This seems below the dignity of the occasion, and of the Speaker. The MSS which insert *again* are generally more remarkable for omissions than additions; but here they are not supported by any ancient Versions, or by early Fathers.

4. *in a place where two ways met.*] Or "on the open place." McClellan renders "the cross road;" Davidson, "the cross way." The meaning is evidently a place in front of the gate, outside of the courtyard; in Latin, "compitum," or "platea."

8. *branches off the trees.*] The oldest MSS have "strawings (στιβάδας, *i. e.* branches or leafage for strewing), having cut them from the fields;" but the text followed by the A. V. is strongly supported. The critical question involved in this reading is discussed fully and fairly by McClellan, who retains the received text.

10. *Blessed...in the name of the Lord.*] The oldest MSS and Versions omit the last words and have "Blessed be the coming kingdom of our father David," *i. e.* the Messianic kingdom now approaching, and about to be established. This clause is peculiar to St. Mark.

11. *into the temple...upon all things.*] This is an important addition to St. Matthew's account. On the day of His arrival our Lord, going at once to the temple, did not act at once, as might have been inferred from the other Gospels, but "looked around upon all things," inspected the whole temple, its buildings, contents, and customs, and then, it being now a late hour, went out to Bethany. St. Matthew, who generally compresses accounts of closely connected events, passes over this visit of inspection as simply preparatory for the formal act of judgment. The impression made upon the disciples by what they now saw prepared them for that act. It accords with our Lord's character that He should act after an interval, rather than on His first entrance, when He was surrounded by an excited multitude.

12–14. SENTENCE PRONOUNCED ON THE BARREN FIG-TREE.

12. *And on the morrow.*] This proves that the previous visit could not, as Keim supposes, have been on a Friday. A Sabbath might have intervened so far as St. Matthew's account is concerned, but St. Mark's statement is explicit. We are now reading what took place on the Monday.

*he was hungry.*] The hunger of our Lord, mentioned also by St. Matthew, may imply that He had passed the night in "prayer and fasting" (ch. ix. 29). He was about to cast out the Evil One from his own Father's house.

13. The variations in this account are noticeable. St. Mark tells us that He saw the fig-tree, covered with leaves, from afar; that He came to it, expecting that it might have fruit. This expectation was not founded on the time of year, for, as St. Mark alone observes, it was not yet the season even for

14 And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever. And his disciples heard *it*.

[h Matt. 21. 12.] 15 ¶ [h] And they come to Jerusalem: and Jesus went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves;

16 And would not suffer that any man should carry *any* vessel through the temple.

17 And he taught, saying unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves.

18 And the scribes and chief priests heard *it*, and sought how they might

---

young figs, which are especially prized for their sweetness and savour, but on the fact that the leaves were out, it being invariably the case that they come out after the early fruit-buds (see Tristram, N. H. p. 351). The tree, probably owing to its situation on a sunny elevation (it was seen from afar), was precocious; it had leaves nearly a month before the usual season, and might therefore be presumed to have fruit also. The points thus noticed are symbolical, true to nature and to history. The tree represents the Hebrew people; the leaves all the outward forms, which, according to the intention of the Founder, should have been signs and accompaniments of holy acts. Our Lord came hungering for such fruits of righteousness, but the time for them, though overdue, was not yet come. N.B.—This explanation is accepted by Meyer and Weiss, and confirmed by Riggenbach, 'Reise nach Palästina,' p. 193. It is objected that the fruit buds are not edible, and that the first ripe fruit is not found before midsummer; cf. Gesen. Thes. *s. v.* בכורה; Wetstein *in loc.*; Van Lennep 'Bible Lands,' i. 139, and Heer, who has an essay on the subject in the 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1874, p. 549, ff. But *unripe* figs were commonly eaten, and were to be looked for after the formation of the leaves. See Tract. Shebhi'ith, iv. 7, ap. Wichelhaus, 'Acad. Vorles.' ii. 291. The explanations proposed by Heer and Van Lennep are encumbered with serious difficulties and cannot be reconciled with St. Mark's statement.

14. *No man eat fruit, &c.*] Or, **may no man** eat, &c. The expression differs from that in St. Matthew: it is even more emphatic, and seems intended to convey a warning specially applicable to converts from Judaism, liable as such, to relapse into old habits. This gives a distinct point to the remark which follows, "and the disciples heard it." They were to take that lesson to themselves.

15–19. VISITATION OF THE TEMPLE, AND CLOSE OF THE SECOND DAY.

15. See notes on St. Matthew. It may be added that certain booths, or bazaars, within the temple-enclosure—probably in an outer court—belonged to the family of the high-priest, who derived a large income from them, especially from the sale of pigeons. They are mentioned frequently in Rabbinical writings as "the booths of the sons of Hanan," *i. e.* Annas (channiyoth bene Hanan). These booths were destroyed about three years before the fall of the temple, probably in the terrible insurrection, when the last of that evil family was massacred. See Derenbourg, 'Histoire de Palestine,' p. 468.

16. *And would not suffer.*] This notice, peculiar to St. Mark, shews that the high-priests permitted some, probably their own attendants, to carry utensils not merely into the precinct of the Temple but through it, making it, so far, a thoroughfare: an abuse not uncommon in days of religious decay.

17. *And he taught.*] Literally, "and He was teaching;" an expression which implies that our Lord then, as was His wont, began to give instruction to the people, referring specially to the preceding transaction.

*shall be called of all nations.*] Rather, "my house shall be called a house of prayer **for all nations.**"

*a den of thieves.*] Derenbourg (*l. c.* p. 467) quotes passages which shew that the bazaars were notorious for fraudful dealings; they were probably let out to traffickers at an exorbitant rate.

18. *And the scribes and chief priests.*] Rather (according to the oldest and best MSS, of different recensions) **And the chief priests and the scribes.** The fury of the chief priests on hearing of these proceedings, which took place in their absence, was natural: their authority and their interests were attacked. But the Scribes must have been moved by different feelings: offended, doubtless, by the assumption of a power to which He could have no claim, save as a Prophet or as the Christ. Neither of these parties, however, could act at once. The Priests were aware that the breach of law originated with them; the Scribes felt that they must, in the

destroy him: for they feared him, because all the people was astonished at his doctrine.

19 And when even was come, he went out of the city.

[a] Matt. 21. 19.

20 ¶ [a]And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig tree dried up from the roots.

21 And Peter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Master, behold, the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away.

22 And Jesus answering saith unto them, [1]Have faith in God.

[1] Or, *Have the faith of God.*

23 For verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith.

24 Therefore I say unto you, [b]What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive *them*, and ye shall have *them*.

[b] Matt. 7. 7.

25 And when ye stand praying, [c]forgive, if ye have ought against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses.

[c] Matt. 6. 14.

26 But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.

27 ¶ And they come again to Jerusalem: [d]and as he was walking in

[d] Matt. 21. 23.

---

first place, overthrow our Lord's authority. The feelings of the people are described in precisely the same terms, as on the occasion when He first came forward as a public Teacher. Cf. ch. i. 22.

20–26. LESSONS CONNECTED WITH THE MIRACLE OF THE BARREN FIG-TREE.

**20.** *And in the morning.*] They had not observed, on the previous evening, that the fig-tree had withered: probably because they returned from the city after sunset.

**21.** *Peter calling to remembrance.*] The name and words of the apostle are recorded, not as reflecting distinction upon him, but probably because they recalled his feelings of perplexity and surprise.

*withered away.*] Or, 'dried up.' The same word is used in the preceding verse.

**23.** *and shall not doubt.*] St. Mark gives the words then spoken more fully than the other Evangelists, especially those which touch the inner state of St. Peter most closely. The removal of the mountain would be understood spiritually. The disciples had a clear Scriptural text interpreting its meaning (Zech. iv. 7), and must have known that it was a metaphor commonly used in the Rabbinical schools; but the promise is general, including all manifestations of supernatural power.

*whatsoever he saith.*] Or, omitting these words, **he shall have it:** lit. it shall be to him.

**24.** *What things soever ye desire, when ye pray.*] Rather "whatsoever things you ask for when praying." The promise is that requests offered by a faithful heart in prayer will be granted, not that all desires will be fulfilled; but in the A.V. the word "desire" is equivalent to "ask for," not to "wish for."

**25.** *forgive...trespasses.*] The introduction of this saying is remarkable. It is certainly not interpolated, not a mere adaptation of a former word of our Lord. It enforces a great truth in reference to the preceding promise. A chief hindrance to the faith, without which there can be no spiritual power, is the presence of angry, uncharitable feelings. When a man prays—whatever be his object, he must put away all malice and hatred from his heart, and specially when he would ask for an intervention of God. The presence of a personal feeling of enmity would convert the prayer for miraculous powers into a deadly sin. Compare with this injunction the close of our Lord's instructions to His disciples in Galilee, ch. ix. 50, where see note. St. Peter's mind was much occupied with this subject, cf. 1 Peter ii. 19, 20, 23; iii. 8, 9; iv. 8.

**26.** *But if ye do not forgive.*] This verse is omitted by Tischendorf and other critics, following their usual authorities, supported by some few other MSS and old Versions. It may be derived from the corresponding passage in Matt. vi. 15; but it is equally probable that it was omitted by an oversight, not uncommon in the oldest MSS.

27–33. INQUIRY AS TO AUTHORITY.

The accounts of the three Synoptists agree closely; those of St. Matthew and St. Mark are all but identical.

**27.** *they come again to Jerusalem.*] The inquiry thus took place on the morning after the sweeping reform of the Temple.

the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders,

28 And say unto him, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority to do these things?

29 And Jesus answered and said unto them, I will also ask of you one [1]question, and answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things.

[1] Or, *thing*.

30 The baptism of John, was *it* from heaven, or of men? answer me.

31 And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not believe him?

32 But if we shall say, Of men; they feared the people: for all *men* counted John, that he was a prophet indeed.

33 And they answered and said unto Jesus, We cannot tell. And Jesus answering saith unto them, Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things.

## CHAPTER XII.

1 *In a parable of the vineyard let out to unthankful husbandmen, Christ foretelleth the reprobation of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles.* 13 *He avoideth the snare of the Pharisees and Herodians about paying tribute to Cæsar:* 18 *convinceth the error of the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection:* 28 *resolveth the scribe, who questioned of the first commandment:* 35 *refuteth the opinion that the scribes held of Christ:* 38 *bidding the people to beware of their ambition and hypocrisy:* 41 *and commendeth the poor widow for her two mites, above all.*

AND [a]he began to speak unto them by parables. A *certain* man planted a vineyard, and set an hedge about *it*, and digged *a place for* the winefat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country.

[a] Matt. 21. 33.

2 And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard.

---

**28.** *and who gave thee this authority?*] Instead of "and" late critical editions have "or," which is preferable, "and" being probably taken from St. Matthew. "Or" draws out the alternative question more distinctly. They would have our Lord declare whether He claimed an inherent authority or a special mission. The answer might support a charge of blasphemy, or lead to a formal trial of His pretensions.

**30.** *answer me.*] Omitted by the other Evangelists, but characteristic at once of St. Mark's animated style and of the Master's earnestness.

**32.** *But if we shall say.*] Or, "**but shall we say, of men?** They feared the people; for every man held of a certainty that the man John was a prophet." The sudden turn, the abrupt break, and the forcible declaration come out most distinctly in St. Mark's account. The word rendered "*if*" is omitted in all the best MSS.

CHAP. XII.—1-12. THE PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.

See notes on St. Matthew. The parable is connected with the symbolical miracle of the fig-tree. It carries on the thought and developes it more fully. The vineyard which was so specially cared for, not only produced no good fruit, but it produced abundance of the deadliest fruits.

The parable, moreover, proves conclusively the erroneousness of the representation of our Lord's feelings given by some critics (see above on ch. xi. 1). Our Lord was in the height of His last outward triumph. His enemies were silenced, the Temple virtually in His possession, the people yielding or applauding His acts; and then, for the first time, He foretold publicly what He had hitherto announced to His disciples in private only, His final rejection, and death.

**1.** *And he began . . . by parables.*] The word "began" implies that up to that time our Lord had not used in Jerusalem this form of instruction, which was expressly intended, in the first instance, for those without (see ch. iv. 11). St. Mark gives only one parable, yet speaks of parables, thus incidentally confirming St. Matthew's account.

**2.** *at the season.*] St. Matthew, "when the time of the fruit drew near;" an expression which might rather have been expected in this gospel, comparing ch. xi. 13.

*a servant.*] St. Matthew has "servants."

3 And they caught *him*, and beat him, and sent *him* away empty.

4 And again he sent unto them another servant; and at him they cast stones, and wounded *him* in the head, and sent *him* away shamefully handled.

5 And again he sent another; and him they killed, and many others; beating some, and killing some.

6 Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, They will reverence my son.

7 But those husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be our's.

8 And they took him, and killed *him*, and cast *him* out of the vineyard.

9 What shall therefore the lord of the vineyard do? he will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others.

10 And have ye not read this scripture; [f]The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner:

11 This was the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?

12 And they sought to lay hold on him, but feared the people: for they knew that he had spoken the parable against them: and they left him, and went their way.

13 ¶ [g]And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, to catch him in *his* words.

14 And when they were come, they say unto him, Master, we know that thou art true, and carest for no man: for thou regardest not the person of men, but teachest the way of God in truth: Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?

15 Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye me? bring me a [1]penny, that I may see *it*.

[f] Ps. 118. 22.
[g] Matt. 22. 15.
[1] Valuing of our money seven-pence halfpenny, as Matt. 18. 28.

---

**3.** *sent him away empty.*] So, too, St. Luke. It expresses very strikingly the frustration of well-grounded expectations, cf. xi. 13.

**4.** *wounded him in the head.*] St. Mark alone has this expression, a somewhat peculiar one in the original. The gradation is most carefully noted. The first servant received no fruit, and was beaten; the second was more cruelly and ignominiously maltreated; the third slain; then many were sent, all in like manner were beaten or slain.

**6.** *Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved.*] The oldest MSS, followed in late critical editions, omit *therefore*, and give this reading, "He hàd yet one Son, well beloved." The construction is thus at once somewhat more abrupt and animated, both points characteristic of St. Mark.

*he sent him also last.*] *Also* is omitted by the same authority. The word *last* has a special force, cf. Heb. i. 2.

**8.** *and killed him, and cast him out.*] The order observed by St. Matthew, who makes expulsion from the vineyard precede death, is reversed. It is less exactly in accordance with the history, yet serves to throw light on the deepest feeling of the enemies of Christ, representing expulsion from the community as the last and greatest penalty. Thus Isaiah, "they made His grave with the wicked." Cf. Heb. xiii. 12.

**12.** *for they knew.*] The word "for" refers to the intention to arrest our Lord, as is evident from St. Matthew's statement. A more difficult and less satisfactory explanation is given by Weiss and Klostermann.

13-17. THE TRIBUTE-MONEY.

**13.** Here St. Mark omits to notice that the Pharisees held a private council (Matt. xxii. 15), and suborned spies (Luke xx. 20); but he mentions at once the two parties, the Herodians and Pharisees, recalling thus to the reader's mind the alliance which had been formed between them at a very early period in our Lord's ministry, see ch. iii. 6. The extreme skill with which this plan was devised and executed is well drawn out by Keim. There was every appearance of its being a movement of genuine curiosity on the part both of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, who, at that time, were on bad terms with the Roman governor: see Luke xxiii. 12.

*in his words.*] Lit. 'in,' or 'by word.'

**15.** *their hypocrisy.*] A very precise and just word: it was consummate acting. St. Matthew has "their wickedness" (but adds, "ye hypocrites"); St. Luke has "craftiness" —both true and forcible words, but less defi-

16 And they brought *it*. And he saith unto them, Whose *is* this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Cæsar's.

17 And Jesus answering said unto them, Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. And they marvelled at him.

h Matt. 22. 23.

18 ¶ [h]Then come unto him the Sadducees, which say there is no resurrection; and they asked him, saying,

19 Master, Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave *his* wife *behind him*, and leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.

20 Now there were seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and dying left no seed.

21 And the second took her, and died, neither left he any seed: and the third likewise.

22 And the seven had her, and left no seed: last of all the woman died also.

23 In the resurrection therefore, when they shall rise, whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife.

24 And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the scriptures, neither the power of God?

25 For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven.

26 And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?

27 He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err.

---

nite. Our Lord saw through their specious acting.

17. *Render to Cæsar.*] The construction, as given in the oldest MSS is very forcible, but not easily rendered: literally, "the (things) of Cæsar render to Cæsar, and the (things) of God to God."

*they marvelled.*] Or, according to the same MSS, marvelled exceedingly (ἐξεθαύμαζον).

18–27. THE QUESTION OF THE SADDUCEES.

The differences in the three Synoptists are very slight. In some passages there is more detail, as usual, in St. Mark: see verses 20–22 and verse 26, where our Evangelist, doubtless for the information of his Roman readers, explains that the "word spoken by God" (Matt. xxii. 31) was in the book of Moses in the passage which describes the appearance "in the bush." He winds up also with a pithy rebuke.

27. *ye therefore do greatly err.*] Some old MSS omit *therefore;* this is in keeping with St. Mark's style; cf. note on v. 8.

This was a peculiarly ingenious attempt. The object of the Sadducees—men of the world, closely connected with the dominant priesthood—was to throw contempt on the doctrine which, as they well knew, our Lord would maintain. If they elicited an unsatisfactory answer, they would dishearten His supporters and remove the only obstacle to an open attack. In our Lord's answer two distinct points call for special notice:—(1.) The wisdom with which, disdaining to notice the captious question, He meets the attack out of the Pentateuch (see note on Matt. xxii. 31), and by an exposition which struck them at once by its novelty and its unanswerable force. We are not to suppose that the exposition, though new to them, was forced or invented for the occasion. It presents, in a clear, short, pregnant sentence the innermost truth involved in the permanent relations between God and His saints; they all live to Him and in Him. The argument, so far as regards the continuance of life, applies *mutatis mutandis* to all His rational and responsible creatures. See Keim, iii. 146. (2.) The view which our Lord gives of the future condition of the risen body. It will be a spiritual body differing, as such, in essential qualities from the natural body. He thus lays down the principle which was afterwards developed and applied by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. Our fleshly nature cannot inherit the kingdom of God until it be transformed and spiritualised.

This answer of our Lord made a strong, and apparently a lasting, impression upon the Jews. It is substantially adopted, in a treatise on the Resurrection, by R. Manasse ben Israel, ap. Schoettgen, quoted by Keim, who

[i] Matt. 22. 35.

28 ¶ [i] And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all?

29 And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments *is*, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord:

30 And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this *is* the first commandment.

31 And the second *is* like, *namely* this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.

32 And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he:

33 And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love *his* neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.

34 And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom

---

says that the passage is very like this, but of late date, and certainly resting upon it. On the other hand, Tanchum, a fair representative of real Judaism, says, "God has connected His name only with the dead;" and he explains away what he considers the only apparent exception (Gen. xxviii. 13) by the assumption that God there speaks of the dust of Isaac —"pulverem Isaaci respexit." Keim treats with just scorn the charge of Strauss, that our Lord adopted Rabbinical dialectics, and he adds, "What is called Rabbinism is a profound sentiment of the eternal import of such a Divine bond with man; the very A B C of Christianity, miserably trampled upon by modern Pantheism." See 'Geschichte Jesu,' vol. iii. p. 145.

28–34. THE GREAT PRINCIPLE OF THE LAW RECOGNISED BY A SCRIBE.

**28.** *And one of the scribes.*] A slight difference in detail between the first two Evangelists has been studiously exaggerated. St. Matthew says that when the Pharisees heard that He had silenced the Sadducees they came together, and that one of them, a scribe or lawyer, asked Him a question, tempting or probing Him. Their feelings, according to that account, were probably mixed; they might rejoice in the discomfiture of their constant opponents, but would test our Lord's own doctrine by a crucial question. This scribe, as St. Mark tells us, had heard the previous discussion, and, as we may reasonably suppose, was on that account accepted by the Pharisees as their representative. He recognised the beauty and force of the answer given to the Sadducees, and was instructed to ask a new and searching question on a point specially interesting to all true Hebrews.

**29.** *of all the commandments.*] These words are omitted in late editions: they are not needed to complete the sense.

On the answer, see notes on St. Matthew. The daily morning prayer of the Jews begins with Deut. vi. 4-9, and is called "the Shema," *i.e.* "Hear;" see Schwab, 'Traité des Berachoth,' p. 177. It was repeated thrice daily; it was the last word of R. Akiba, the representative of strictest Pharisaism in the latter part of the first century.

**32.** *Well, Master, thou hast said the truth.*] This recognition by the scribe goes beyond any admission which had hitherto been seriously made by our Lord's opponents. Wrung from the scribe by a sudden and sincere conviction (see verse 34), it gave an attestation of great legal weight to the soundness of our Saviour's ethical doctrine, which was not called into question on the trial before Caiaphas. The word "well" is emphatic, referring to the impression previously described in verse 28.

**33.** *more than all whole burnt offerings, &c.*] From this it may, perhaps, be inferred that the question was intended to elicit some statement touching the relative importance of the ceremonial and the moral law. Reuss has an observation upon our Lord's answer, which is applicable to that of the scribe:— "Sa déclaration est d'autant plus remarquable et significative que l'esprit du judaïsme traditionnel, légal et scolastique se plaçait à un point de vue tout différent. Là on n'admettait point cette distinction de commandements plus grands, plus excellents, plus fondamentaux que d'autres, ou bien, si l'on se préoccupait d'un pareil triage dans la pratique, on s'attachait de préférence à des prescriptions tout extérieures et rituelles" (Luke xi. 42; Matt. xxiii. 23). See 'Histoire évangélique,' p. 576.

of God. And no man after that durst ask him *any question.*

35 ¶ [a] And Jesus answered and said, while he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that Christ is the son of David?

[a] Matt. 22. 41

36 For David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The LORD said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.

37 David therefore himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he *then* his son? And the common people heard him gladly.

38 ¶ And he said unto them in his doctrine, [b] Beware of the scribes, which love to go in long clothing, and *love* salutations in the marketplaces,

[b] Matt. 23. 5

39 And the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts:

40 [c] Which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation.

[c] Matt. 23 14.

41 ¶ [d] And Jesus sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast [1] money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much.

[d] Luke 21. 1.

[1] *A piece of brass money:* See Matt. 10. 9.

---

**34.** *Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.*] Our Lord thus formally recognises the good faith of this questioner, the only one who had hitherto approached Him with an honest desire to know the truth. It was the last and greatest triumph over His assailants. He had put all others to shame; this one He convinced and brought to the very border of the kingdom of God.

35–37. THE QUESTION AS TO THE SON OF DAVID.

**35.** *And Jesus answered . . . temple.*] St. Matthew adds, "while the Pharisees were gathered together." After the preceding discourse our Lord continued His public teaching, the Pharisees still watching Him. He *answered* their thought. The point which now occupied their minds—the question as to moral teaching being settled—would naturally be what were His views touching the Person of Christ. He asks, What are your views? The scribes say He is the Son of David; what does that mean? Does it mean simply a descendant, a successor, not differing from Him in nature? How then do you explain his own saying? It clearly could not be explained from their point of view. See notes on Matt. xxii. 45, and cf. Barnab. Ep. xii. § 10.

Those modern commentators who will not accept the teaching of Scripture are equally at a loss. Reuss holds that our Lord meant He was not David's successor in any true sense. Renan takes it as a repudiation of all claims to be the Son of David. The meaning is clear to all who receive St. Paul's statement, Rom. i. 3, 4, concerning "His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared (not *made*) to be the Son of God, with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."

**37.** *And the common people.*] Literally, "and the great multitude," *i. e.* the great mass of the people, not, as our Version might imply, the lower orders, but all the bystanders, who did not share the prejudices of His opponents. It is evident that they did not understand the question as a repudiation of descent from David, but as exposing the pretensions of the scribes, and indicating a far higher sense in Messianic prophecies than any recognised by them.

38–40. DENUNCIATION OF THE SCRIBES.

**38.** *in his doctrine.*] Either in the discourse, in which, without reference to the teaching of others, He unfolded His own doctrine; or, it may be, more simply, in His public teaching. The rupture is now complete. The most unsparing denunciations against false, hypocritical teachers recorded in the Bible are given fully by St. Matthew; from these St. Mark has a few salient points. He signalises the most prominent characteristics of the scribes belonging to the Pharisaic party—ostentation, arrogance, rapacity, and, as the climax of all, religious hypocrisy. The question whether St. Mark abridges the Apostolical tradition, or St. Matthew, as on some other occasions, brings together words of similar import spoken at different times, presents considerable difficulty; but it may be certainly inferred that St. Mark could not have had the first gospel before him, considering the great importance of the points which he omits, especially the solemn close.

**40.** *damnation.*] Rather **condemnation**: will be judged and punished more severely: see note on xvi. 16.

41–44. THE WIDOW'S MITES.

This exquisitely beautiful narrative is preserved by St. Mark and St. Luke. It stands

42 And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two [1]mites, which make a farthing.

[1] It is the seventh part of one piece of that brass money.

43 And he called *unto him* his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That this poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury:

44 For all *they* did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living.

## CHAPTER XIII.

1 *Christ foretelleth the destruction of the temple:* 9 *the persecutions for the gospel:* 10 *that the gospel must be preached to all nations:* 14 *that great calamities shall happen to the Jews:* 24 *and the manner of his coming to judgment:* 32 *the hour whereof being known to none, every man is to watch and pray, that we be not found unprovided, when he cometh to each one particularly by death.*

AND [a]as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings *are here!*

[a] Matt. 24. 1.

---

out in striking contrast with the preceding denunciations; but the transition from wrath to tenderness, equally characteristic of true holiness, fitly marks the close of our Saviour's public teaching. His last words in the Temple are words of grace.

**41.** *And Jesus sat over against the treasury.*] At the conclusion of the preceding discourse our Lord took His seat (not "was sitting") opposite the treasury, which was on the north side of the outer court, in which He sometimes taught. See John viii. 20.

*and beheld.*] Or "**He was observing.**" The word implies attention to the acts of the people, who would seem to have been then offering gifts with more than usual profuseness whatever might have been their motives, whether they were touched by His previous discourses or were displaying their liberality. The latter motive more probably predominated, especially in the case of the rich donors, who seem to have given their alms ostentatiously. Gifts were put into apertures, called, from their shape, "trumpets," of which, according to the Talmud (Mishna, Shekalim, vi. § 5), there were thirteen in the wall of the outer court, some with special inscriptions marking the destination of offerings, whether voluntary or legal; through those apertures the money or gifts passed into the several departments of the treasury.

**42.** *a certain poor widow.*] The word rendered "poor" is a very strong one, nearly equivalent to "beggar." It implies utter destitution.

*two mites.*] Less than two mites was not permitted by law, but the offering was voluntary. See Schoettgen, 'H. H.,' i. 250.

**43.** *which have cast.*] Rather, **who are casting**. So the best MSS. The words were spoken while the offerings were being made.

**44.** *of their abundance.*] Literally, "superfluity," in sharp antithesis to the "want," the destitution of the widow.

*all her living.*] *I. e.* her means of subsistence; yet the word seems chosen expressly to indicate entire devotion of herself, her life, as well as livelihood, to God's service. Irenæus (iv. 4, § 2, p. 614 ed. St.) regards this as a lively figure of the difference between the Jews, who offered partial oblations, and Christians who, as such, devote cheerfully and freely to their Lord's service all that they have and are.

Such is the last picture of our Lord's proceedings in His Father's house.

### CHAP. XIII.—THE GREAT PROPHECY.

This chapter coincides so nearly with St. Matt. xxiv. as to prove identity of origin, but with differences in style and detail which are best accounted for by the independence of both Evangelists. The points common to them have been exhaustively dealt with in Dean Mansel's notes on St. Matthew. Here attention will be chiefly given to divergences.

### 1–4. THE QUESTION OF THE DISCIPLES.

**1.** *as he went out of the temple.*] Or "as He **was going forth** from the Temple." Our Lord probably left the Temple by the so-called Golden Gate, on the east. The view there is peculiarly striking. "The wavy course of the eastern wall" (see 'Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem,' p. 36), and the massive structure of the gate, are specially noticeable. The Gate is associated with ancient legends; the two columns, 16 feet in circumference, which support its roof, are believed by the Mussulman to have been presented to Solomon by the Queen of Sheba.

*what manner of stones and what buildings.*] The immense size of the stones in the eastern wall, here pointed to by the disciples, has impressed travellers so strongly that it has become a common, but erroneous, opinion that "wherever they are found in masses they must necessarily be in their original

2 And Jesus answering said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

3 And as he sat upon the mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately,

4 [f]Tell us, when shall these things be? and what *shall be* the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?

[f] Matt. 24. 3.

---

position" ('Ordnance Survey,' p. 24); but Captain Wilson, who conducted the survey, proves that the present wall has been rebuilt, "probably on the foundation of the older one, and the same stones re-used;" so that the present condition of the eastern wall enables us at once to realise the grandeur of the old structure and the completeness of its overthrow. "The material used in the older portions of the wall is extremely hard and good, and may be readily recognised in the wall by the sharpness of its angles, which are often as clean and perfect as when they left the masons' hands." See also the notice by Sir Henry James, in the same work, p. 14:—"The lower courses of the masonry are composed of immense stones, one of which is no less than 23 feet 8 inches long and 4 feet deep; and there is a wide 'marginal draft' 5½ inches wide to these stones, giving the masonry a very bold and at the same time a very peculiar character." This, as Sir H. James observes, bears out the description of Josephus, if not his assertion that "the wall was of itself the most prodigious work that was ever heard of by man." Dr. Farrar draws from Josephus a striking account of the majesty and beauty of the whole Temple enclosure.

**2.** *Seest thou.*] The question concentrates attention both upon what the disciple—probably St. Andrew, see note on verse 3—had already observed, and upon the prediction which immediately follows.

*there shall not be left one stone.*] Or, left **here**: see below. The literal fulfilment of this prophecy has been repeatedly questioned even by earnest Christians, who have been satisfied with the certain proofs of a general overthrow; but the notices quoted above, and others in the same work, containing the results of close, scientific examination, prove the exact and complete fulfilment. Captain Wilson says, l. c., "There is certainly nothing now 'in situ' in the Haram wall, except perhaps the south-west corner and a portion of the wall under the Mahkama:" not any portion, therefore, on which our Lord's disciples were then gazing.

N.B.—After the words "shall not be left," a great number of MSS, including those generally followed by Tischendorf and Weiss, insert **here**, which is regarded by those critics as an interpolation from St. Matthew, where the reading is unquestioned. It seems far more probable that St. Mark retained the word; he seldom omits a graphic detail. In this case it is one that accords very remarkably with the facts ascertained by scientific inquiry.

*that shall not be thrown down.*] The expression in the Greek is more accurate—**shall not be loosed**, displaced, so as not to remain "in situ:" the exact impression made upon the mind of the engineer.

**3.** *the temple.*] St. Mark thus fixes attention on the central point of our Lord's prediction. He and His disciples looked down upon the whole extent of the Temple enclosure from the height which commands by far the finest view of the city.

*Peter, &c.*] St. Mark alone names the four disciples who addressed to our Lord the question which gave occasion to the greatest of all prophecies. The word "privately" might seem to imply that they spoke to our Lord apart from the Twelve; but it is more probably to be understood in a wider sense, including those whom He usually instructed "in private," cf. note on ch. vi. 34. The mention of the four is regarded (Weiss) as very probably a personal reminiscence of St. Peter. Andrew is here, and here alone, named together with the Three, from which it has been inferred that he may have been the "one of His disciples" (verse 1) who had previously spoken. It is somewhat remarkable that just about this time, probably on the afternoon of the same day, St. Andrew is mentioned by St. John (ch. xii. 22; see also John vi. 8, and i. 40, 41) as in special relation to our Lord's Person.

**4.** *when all these things shall be fulfilled.*] Instead of these words, St. Matthew has "of Thy coming and of the end of the world:" thus presenting the future events referred to under two distinct aspects. St. Mark appears to represent them as closely connected, if not inseparable: a point of great importance as affecting the interpretation of some portions of the prophecy.

5–8. Premonitory Signs and Warnings.

There is no question about this portion. Our Lord, in the first place, gives an answer which applies to the state of His disciples' feelings. The danger was lest, in their earnest longing for His coming, they should be misled

5 And Jesus answering them began to say, Take heed lest any *man* deceive you:

6 For many shall come in my name, saying, I am *Christ;* and shall deceive many.

7 And when ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars, be ye not troubled: for *such things* must needs be; but the end *shall* not *be* yet.

8 For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be earthquakes in divers places, and there shall be famines and troubles: these *are* the beginnings of [1]sorrows.

[1] The word in the original importeth *the pains of a woman in travail.*

9 ¶ But take heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten: and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them.

10 And the gospel must first be published among all nations.

11 [g]But when they shall lead *you*, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.

[g] Matt. 10. 19.

12 Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and children shall rise up against *their* parents, and shall cause them to be put to death.

13 And ye shall be hated of all *men* for my name's sake: but he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.

14 ¶ [h]But when ye shall see the

[h] Matt. 24. 15.

---

by impostors, or unduly depressed by political convulsions and disturbances of nature occurring in the interval; on which see notes on St. Matthew.

**6.** *For many.*] Both in this and in the next verse the word *for* is omitted by the best MSS. This is in accordance with St. Mark's style. So too in *v.* 9.

**8.** *and troubles.*] These words, omitted in the oldest MSS, are probably genuine; it is far more likely that they should have been overlooked by an early copyist than that they should have been interpolated, not being extant in the other Gospels.

**9.** *in the synagogues.*] Literally "into the synagogues," a pregnant construction: "ye shall be taken into the synagogues and beaten there." Alford. Cf. Acts xxii. 19.

9–13. Tribulations of the Church in the Interval.

St. Mark gives the fullest account of the persecutions to which the first believers were subjected; but St. Matthew has the same words in ch. x. 17–22. Here they seem to be in their original place, belonging specially to occurrences between the Resurrection and the overthrow of Jerusalem. The extent and character of the persecutions during that period have been much disputed; but that they were general throughout the empire, and exceedingly cruel, has been lately shewn by M. Boissier, in the 'Revue archéologique,' 1876, pp. 118, 119.

**10.** *the gospel . . . all nations.*] This statement is of extreme importance. A long interval before the end must be allowed for the publishing or preaching of the Gospel; comparing the words of St. Luke xxi. 24, it would seem to include the whole period which would elapse before the last day. St. Paul uses expressions which imply a virtual fulfilment before the fall of Jerusalem (see Rom. x. 18); still the words of our Lord are so strong as to make the former inference all but certain. See notes on St. Matthew.

One great point stands out distinctly: tribulation must be the portion of the Church throughout the interval, whatever may be its duration, which must elapse until the Gospel has been preached in all the world. That was the main point to be fixed in the minds of the disciples.

**11.** *neither do ye premeditate.*] The word denotes specially careful preparation for a discourse: but it is omitted in some of the oldest MSS, and may have been a gloss explaining the words previously used.

14–23. Special Warnings touching the Interval immediately preceding the Destruction of Jerusalem.

**14.** *But when ye shall see.*] The word "but" refers to the last verse preceding. Endurance of persecution has here a limit. Christians are to hold out to the end; but that does not imply they are to remain in Jerusalem up to the day of its destruction. A sign, such as the disciples had asked for, would be given:

abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judæa flee to the mountains:

15 And let him that is on the housetop not go down into the house, neither enter *therein*, to take any thing out of his house:

16 And let him that is in the field not turn back again for to take up his garment.

17 But woe to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days!

18 And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter.

19 For *in* those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be.

20 And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days.

21 [i] And then if any man shall say to you, Lo, here *is* Christ; or, lo, *he is* there; believe *him* not:

[i] Matt. 24. 23.

22 For false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if *it were* possible, even the elect.

23 But take ye heed: behold, I have foretold you all things.

24 ¶ [k] But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light,

[k] Matt. 24. 29.

25 And the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken.

26 And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory.

---

when they beheld that sign they were at once to flee. On the meaning of the sign see notes on St. Matthew.

*spoken of by Daniel the prophet.*] This clause is omitted in late critical editions; it is not extant in the oldest MSS or Versions, and is held by critics to be inserted from the corresponding passage in St. Matthew, where the reading is universally accepted. It is contrary to St. Mark's usage to name a prophet, with the single exception of Isaiah in a discourse of our Lord, ch. vii. 6. See note on ch. i. 2. The reference, however, to Daniel is not less certain than in the other Gospel.

**15.** *neither enter therein.*] This confirms an explanation noticed, but not adopted, by Dean Mansel. The stairs of common houses were on the outside wall; a man would therefore have to go down, and then enter the house, in order to get his outer garments.

**17.** *woe to them.*] Or, "alas! for them." It is an exclamation of compassion and tenderness: a sense not usually attached to the expression here used in the A. V.

**18.** St. Mark omits "on the Sabbath" as a point of no special interest to his own readers. See note on St. Matthew.

**20.** *except that the Lord had shortened.*] The difference between St Matthew and St. Mark, noticed by Dean Mansel, consists in the more specific mention of the LORD, and in the insertion of the clause "*whom He hath chosen*," or **whom He chose.** The word rendered "shortened" is of extremely rare occurrence, found once only in the LXX, where it means "mutilated," and in these two passages only in the N. T. It is rare also in classic Greek. The shortening of the time refers to the interval between the entrance of the invading army and the destruction of Jerusalem.

**23.** *But take ye heed.*] The word "ye" is emphatic; but as for you, who have been forewarned, take heed; watch all indications of the fulfilment.

24–32. THE SECOND COMING.

**24.** *But in those days, after that tribulation.*] The first words correspond to, and explain, St. Matthew's word "immediately." From this it would seem to follow that the events now to be described would occur immediately after the overthrow of the Hebrew dispensation; if so, they must be understood in a spiritual or symbolical sense.

**25.** *the stars of heaven shall fall.*] Rather, **the stars shall be falling from heaven.**

**26.** *And then shall they see the Son of man.*] Comparing this with our Lord's statement before Caiaphas, Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69, we should infer that this prophecy applies primarily to a manifestation of the Son of God in power within the lifetime of the hearers; if so, the angels sent forth to "gather together His elect" would refer primarily to His messengers, *i. e.* the

27 And then shall he send his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.

28 Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near:

29 So ye in like manner, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know that it is nigh, *even* at the doors.

30 Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done.

31 Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.

32 ¶ But of that day and *that* hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

33 [a] Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is.

[a] Matt. 24. 42.

34 *For the Son of man is* as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch.

35 Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning:

36 Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping.

---

Apostles and their immediate successors. The wider range of the prophecy, and its reference to the last judgment, are shewn in the notes on St. Matthew.

**32.** *neither the Son.*] According to the received text, followed by the A. V., this important addition is given by St. Mark only. As Dean Mansel has observed, it is found in St. Matthew also, according to some ancient MSS (ch. xxiv. 36). Those MSS—not, as in the case of many disputed readings, of one recension only—are so far supported by ancient versions and quotations by early Fathers as to justify Tischendorf's conclusion, that although in the fourth century these words are omitted in most Greek and some Latin MSS, yet in the second century they were generally received as belonging to St. Matthew's text. It is certain that they would not have been written by either Evangelist, had they not formed part of the original apostolical tradition, whether written or oral. The statement of St. Ambrosius, 'De Fide,' v. s. 193, that the words do not appear in ancient MSS of this gospel, is wholly unsupported, and is directly contradicted by the unanimous testimony of the Greek Fathers, quoted by Canon Liddon in his 8th 'Bampton Lecture.' With regard to the doctrinal bearings, it should be observed: (1.) That the appellation THE SON, applied thus absolutely to our Lord by His own words, is one of the highest grandeur and significance, cf. Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 20. It separates Him essentially from all created beings, "as begotten, not made," and gives a special solemnity to he declaration that the knowledge here spoken of was withheld from Him, as the Fathers say with perfect propriety, *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, *i. e.* in reference to His human nature and state of voluntary humiliation, in which His wisdom was progressive, and superhuman knowledge communicated so far as it might be needed or conducive to the edification of the Church. (2.) In the present instance, a precise knowledge of the future was not communicated through Christ to His people then or even after His Resurrection: see Acts i. 7. What the disciples did learn was the signal of the approaching overthrow of Jerusalem; by that their own actions were to be determined. What they did not learn—as forming no part of the revealed scheme of Redemption—was the epoch of the Last Advent, a knowledge of which, if near at hand, might paralyse the Church, and, if postponed for a far distant period, would make watchfulness wholly impossible, thus directly frustrating the great practical lesson which concludes the whole discourse. For a full discussion of the subject, see Lightfoot *in loc.*; Waterland, vol. i. part 2, pp. 70–79; Thorndike, vol. iii. part 1, p. 276; Canon Liddon, 'Bampton Lectures,' p. 687; and, for a summary statement, Bengel's 'Gnomon' *in loc.*

**33–37.** St. Mark gives, in a very concise and abridged form, the substance and practical bearings of the parables, which are here recorded by St. Matthew, xxiv. 42–51, and xxv. 14–30.

**35.** *at even .. morning.*] The four regular watches, from eventide to daybreak, representing either periods in the world's history, or epochs in human life.

37 And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.

## CHAPTER XIV.

1 *A conspiracy against Christ.* 3 *Precious ointment is poured on his head by a woman.* 10 *Judas selleth his Master for money.* 12 *Christ himself foretelleth how he shall be betrayed of one of his disciples:* 22 *after the passover prepared, and eaten, instituteth his supper:* 26 *declareth aforehand the flight of all his disciples, and Peter's denial,* 43 *Judas betrayeth him with a kiss.* 46 *He is apprehended in the garden,* 53 *falsely accused, and impiously condemned of the Jews' council:* 65 *shamefully abused by them:* 66 *and thrice denied of Peter.*

AFTER [b]two days was *the feast of* the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put *him* to death.

[b] Matt. 26. 2.

2 But they said, Not on the feast *day*, lest there be an uproar of the people.

3 ¶ [c]And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of [1]spikenard very precious: and she brake the box, and poured *it* on his head.

[c] Matt. 26. 6.

[1] Or, *pure nard*, or, *liquid nard*.

4 And there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said, Why was this waste of the ointment made?

CHAP. XIV.—1–11. EVENTS PREPARATORY TO DEATH, THE COUNCIL, THE ANOINTING, AND THE BETRAYAL.

From this point to the resurrection there is an almost complete and minute agreement in the synoptical narratives; shewing not only that the Evangelists had the same accounts distinctly impressed upon their memory, but that it was regarded as so peculiarly sacred a portion of the history as to allow no modification in the order of events, such as might be suitable elsewhere in order to bring out some leading thought. In this part of our commentary points of difference will alone call for notice, unless later works add aught of importance to the commentary on St. Matthew, left incomplete at the death of Dean Mansel.

1. *the chief priests and the scribes.*] St. Matthew, "the chief priests and the elders of the people," *i.e.* the Sanhedrim. St. Mark names the two classes in the council who combined to destroy our Lord. Both had on that day received the last and most effective blow on their character and authority: successive defeats on their several encounters, specially on points in which they held themselves to be masters, had been followed by an unsparing denunciation of their vices. St. Matthew mentions the house of Caiaphas as the place where the Sanhedrim was at once assembled.

3. It is generally assumed that the following event also took place on the Tuesday evening; but there is no word which directly states this, and, if with Dean Mansel and most critics we hold the identity of the transaction with that related by St. John, ch. xii. 1, 8, it took place four days earlier, on our Lord's first arrival at Bethany. Nor is the reason for giving the account in this part of the history an inadequate one. The evil passions of Judas Iscariot were then stirred, and probably the determination to betray his Master was then finally adopted.

The Synoptists give no account of our Lord's proceedings on Wednesday. St. Luke, however, states that He passed the days in the Temple, and the nights only at Bethany, so that it may be inferred that the very striking events, and still more striking discourses related by St. John, xii. 20–36, belong to that day. The three Evangelists record only those discourses which were connected with assaults of His antagonists. On Tuesday the battle had been fought and won, the issue already decided.

*of spikenard.*] St. Mark has an epithet, used by St. John also, xii. 3, which has given more than usual trouble to commentators. At present there is a general agreement that it means "genuine." So Meyer, Weiss, Reuss (who renders it "pure"); but though probable this interpretation is not certain. The discussion has little interest save as a question of philology; but it is treated at great length by Fritzsche, and very pithily by Lücke on St. John. If we accept it, we may see in it a certain symbolism; the genuine ointment was an offering and representation of sincere love. The rendering of the A.V., "*spikenard*" seems intended to express spicata nardus, an unguent drawn from well-known aromatic herbs. So the Vulgate and many commentators of weight, Grotius, Wetstein, and Rosenmüller.

4. *had indignation within themselves, and said.*] Or, according to some MSS, *said indignantly to* one another; the murmurs were general, though one took the lead.

5 For it might have been sold for more than three hundred [1]pence, and have been given to the poor. And they murmured against her.

[1] See Matt. 18. 28.

6 And Jesus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me.

7 For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good: but me ye have not always.

8 She hath done what she could: she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying.

9 Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, *this* also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

10 ¶ [d]And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests, to betray him unto them.

[d] Matt. 26. 14.

11 And when they heard *it*, they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently betray him.

12 ¶ [e]And the first day of unleavened bread, when they [1]killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare, that thou mayest eat the passover?

[e] Matt. 26. 17. [1] Or, *sacrificed*.

13 And he sendeth forth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him.

14 And wheresover he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guest-

---

**5.** *three hundred pence.*] Or, "**300 denarii.**" On the amount, see note on St. Matthew. It will be remembered that 200 denarii nearly sufficed to buy bread for 5000 men with their families. One denarius was full pay for a day's work at harvest time.

*And they murmured against her.*] The word is strong, used by St. Mark only, and always to express extreme indignation: it implies that they were rebuking her, and that vehemently.

**6.** *Let her alone.*] St. John xii. 7, has the same word, but addressed to Judas only.

**7.** *and whensoever ye will ye may do them good.*] Or, **can** *do them good:* an incidental exhortation to beneficence recorded by St. Mark only.

**8.** *She hath done what she could.*] A general truth, but with a practical application; she had a work which she could do then, and seized the occasion beforehand (προέλαβεν) anticipating the funeral unction.

**10.** *went unto.*] The connexion, which Weiss unreasonably questions, is obvious. The council is held, and at the same time the transaction occurs which supplies the Sanhedrim with an unexpected instrument.

**11.** *he sought how, &c.*] This implies that some time elapsed between the conception of the deed and its execution (see note on v. 3). The arrest could not be made at Bethany where our Lord was surrounded by friends, and probably by many who had accompanied Him at the entrance into Jerusalem. An occasion must be found when He would be alone with the twelve.

12–16. PREPARATION FOR THE LAST SUPPER.

**13.** *And he sendeth forth two of his disciples.*] This account is at once graphic and complete, save that St. Mark does not give the names of the two, viz. Peter and John (Luke xxii. 8); this accords with his practice on occasions where St. Peter is specially concerned.

*there shall meet you a man, &c.*] This circumstantial detail is not without a special point. Judas was watching for an opportunity: had he known in what place our Lord was to be found out of the Temple, arrest would have been easy. But two disciples only were sent, and even they would not know where our Lord would be that evening; for the unknown guide was to meet them on their arrival. Were any justification needed for a display of supernatural foresight—regarded by some as uncalled for—this would be an ample one. No precaution was omitted until the time was fully come. But though probable, even this assumption is not necessary. St. Mark's words are compatible with a previous arrangement, the object certainly being not to astonish the disciples, but to guard against a premature betrayal.

**14.** *Where is the guest-chamber?*] Or, according to the oldest MSS and Versions, *Where is my resting-place?* (κατάλυμα, the room in which a traveller rests after a journey). That was His last resting-place on earth. The word (not a classical one) is thus significant.

chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?

15 And he will shew you a large upper room furnished *and* prepared: there make ready for us.

16 And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

17 And in the evening he cometh with the twelve.

18 *f* And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me.

*f* Matt. 26. 20.

19 And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, *Is* it I? and another *said*, *Is* it I?

20 And he answered and said unto them, *It is* one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish.

21 The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born.

22 ¶ *g* And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake *it*, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is my body.

*g* Matt. 26. 26.

23 And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave *it* to them: and they all drank of it.

24 And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.

---

*where I shall eat the passover.*] St. Matthew has "keep," lit. "do" (ποιῶ)—important as at once shewing that the word "do" (ποιῶ) has a solemn meaning connected with a sacred rite, and that in this case it is not equivalent to "sacrifice." The sacrifice was completed before our Lord came to the house in which He kept this Passover.

**15.** *a large upper room furnished and prepared.*] This indicates a house of considerable size, such upper chambers belonging only to the houses of the upper classes. The word "furnished" (ἐστρωμένον) applies specially to the tapestry spread over the couches for the reception of guests: they would find all things ready. "There," our Lord adds, "make ready for us," purchasing and preparing the lamb, and the other requisites for the Paschal supper. See next verse.

No indication is found as to the owner of the house; but it must be assumed that he was known to the disciples, or certainly to our Lord, as a convert, a man too of distinction; the name of Nicodemus, or rather of Joseph of Arimathea, occurs naturally; but there is some reason to think that the house belonged to St. Mark's family. See note on verse 51.

The two disciples must have gone early in the day: they had first to find the place, meeting the attendant when he went to the well on the road to get water, probably early in the morning, see note on Luke xxii. 10: the forenoon, and indeed the whole day, would be occupied with necessary preparations.

17–25. THE LAST SUPPER.

**18.** *which eateth with me.*] Or, **one of you shall betray me, he who eateth with me.** A touching word, such as St. Mark loves to bring to his reader's mind.

**19.** *and another said, Is it I?*] This clause is omitted by some, not all, old MSS, and by some editors. The reasons for and against omission are nearly equal.

**20.** *one of the twelve.*] Omitted by St. Matthew. St. Mark has also "that dippeth" in the present tense, shewing that the words were spoken just when Judas was in the act of brotherly communion, expressed by putting a piece of bread into the common dish. Meyer supposes that Judas must have been close to our Lord. Possibly he might; if the Apostles were sitting in order of rank, Judas would be on His left hand: but the Apostles probably one and all dipped their bread in the central dish.

**21.** St. Matthew adds the words specially addressed to Judas. Judas then seems to have left the room: no word after this indicates his presence.

**22.** Recent editors, following the oldest MSS and Versions, omit "eat" after "take."

**23.** *and they all drank of it.*] St. Matthew gives the command, St. Mark records the obedience.

**24.** *of the new testament.*] Or, *of the covenant.* The word *new* is omitted in all the oldest MSS but one. *Covenant* expresses the Greek more nearly than *testament*, but neither word exhausts the meaning. The blood of Jesus at once ratifies the covenant of grace, and conveys the gifts bequeathed by Him to His Church.

*for the remission of sins.*] This clause is omitted in all the best MSS, and is probably inserted here from St. Matthew.

25 Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

26 ¶ And when they had sung an [1]hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives.

[1] Or, *psalm.*

27 [h]And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.

[h] Matt. 26. 31.

28 But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee.

29 [i]But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be offended, yet *will* not I.

[i] Matt. 26. 33.

30 And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this day, *even* in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice.

31 But he spake the more vehemently, If I should die with thee, I will not deny thee in any wise. Likewise also said they all.

32 [k]And they came to a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith to his disciples, Sit ye here, while I shall pray.

[k] Matt. 26. 36.

33 And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy;

34 And saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and watch.

35 And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him.

36 And he said, Abba, Father, all things *are* possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.

37 And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon,

---

**25.** *Verily I say, &c.*] This saying is recorded by all the Evangelists, St. Matthew adding the important words "with you."

26–31. THE DEPARTURE.

**26, 27.** Identical with St. Matthew. At the end of the first clause St. Luke adds, "as He was wont." This may be inferred from our narrative. Judas must have known where they were going—in the direction of Bethany, yet not far on the way, probably to the first place where they might rest undisturbed. See John xviii. 2. In *v.* 27, old MSS and Versions omit *in this night.*

**30.** *crow twice.*] This is mentioned by St. Mark only. It is a great aggravation of St. Peter's guilt. The first warning was unheeded. In Palestine travellers complain of being awakened regularly three times in the night by the sudden crowing of the cocks. The first crowing is between eleven and twelve, the second between one and two o'clock, the third an hour before dawn. See Tristram, N. H. B. 221. It may be concluded, therefore, that the first crowing which St. Peter heard was that at one or two, and the second at about five A.M. The midnight crowing would thus not be counted: it would, indeed, be too early. The first trial in the house of Caiaphas could scarcely have taken place before one or two o'clock.

32–42. GETHSEMANE.

**33.** *to be sore amazed.*] The rendering is very accurate. St. Mark alone uses the word (ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι); it is much stronger than St. Matthew's "grieved," indicating amazement at the direct full intuition into the abyss of evil, by which He was for a season to be overwhelmed.

*very heavy.*] So too St. Matthew (where see note); but the original (ἀδημονεῖν) is a very awful word.

**35.** Note the fuller detail: "let this *hour* pass from me." The hour is that of the supreme crisis; the hour of dread spiritual anguish.

**36.** *Abba Father.*] *Abba* thenceforth became a watchword even with Gentile Christians, a word of vital union with the Son. *Father* is added by St. Mark, probably as an explanation needed by some of his readers.

*all things are possible unto thee.*] For all things depend on God's will. Here the only question is, whether the will of God—in other words, whether absolute righteousness—would require and exact the atonement.

*take away this cup from me.*] The expression is noticeable; it is specially applied to the act of removing food or cups from a table.

**37.** *Simon.*] A word here used with a special significance, recalling old feelings of

sleepest thou? couldest not thou watch one hour?

38 Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly *is* ready, but the flesh *is* weak.

39 And again he went away, and prayed, and spake the same words.

40 And when he returned, he found them asleep again, (for their eyes were heavy,) neither wist they what to answer him.

41 And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take *your* rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.

42 Rise up, let us go; lo, he that betrayeth me is at hand.

[a] Matt. 26. 47.

43 ¶ [a] And immediately, while he yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders.

44 And he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he; take him, and lead *him* away safely.

45 And as soon as he was come, he goeth straightway to him, and saith, Master, master; and kissed him.

46 ¶ And they laid their hands on him, and took him.

47 And on of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear.

48 And Jesus answered and said unto them, Are ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and *with* staves to take me?

49 I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took me not: but the scriptures must be fulfilled.

50 And they all forsook him, and fled.

51 And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth

---

the natural man, not without a reference to the words recorded by St. Luke xxii. 31.

*couldest not thou.*] Or, 'wert thou unable.' See note on St. Matthew, who has 'you' for 'thou.' The address to St. Peter has a special significance in reference to his protestations.

**40.** *neither wist they what to answer him.*] St. Peter remembered, doubtless, what had been his feelings on the Holy Mount, see ch. ix. 6. There he was perplexed and sore afraid; here all three were utterly confounded.

St. Matthew tells us that, leaving them, He prayed again, using the same words; St. Mark does not usually omit such details.

**41.** *it is enough.*] Thus the Vulgate. The meaning is questioned, but the word seems naturally to refer to His previous command. They were bidden to watch during His agonizing struggle: that is over; no more watching at present is needed. See note on St. Matthew.

**42.** This exclamation implies that, immediately after the words preceding were spoken, our Lord heard the traitor with the band approaching.

*let us go.*] *I. e.* go forth to meet him.

43–52. THE CAPTURE.

**43.** With the exception of a few words, this verse and the beginning of the following are the same in the first two Evangelists. St. Luke differs slightly.

*and the scribes.*] St. Mark mentions them specially, as in verse 1, evidently as taking a high place in the Sanhedrim.

**44.** *and lead him away safely.*] Words arguing deliberate malice, shewing, perhaps, that Judas feared an attempt at rescue.

*Master, master.*] The word, Rabbi.

**47.** *one of them that stood by.*] The name of Peter is not given by the Synoptists (see note on St. Matthew); but the omission by St. Mark shews that he regarded it as an act of true, though ill-informed, zeal. The context indicates that the three who had watched with our Lord were alone present; the other disciples were in the garden, but there is no reason to suppose that they came forward. Had they wished it, they could hardly have forced their way through the attendants.

*a servant of.*] Or, "the servant of the high priest;" the man, therefore, who was probably the leader of the band. His name, Malchus, is given by St. John.

**51.** *a certain young man.*] This notice is found in St. Mark only. It is a probable

cast about *his* naked *body;* and the young men laid hold on him:

52 And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked.

[b] Matt. 26. 57.

53 ¶ [b]And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and with him were assembled all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes.

54 And Peter followed him afar off, even into the palace of the high priest: and he sat with the servants, and warmed himself at the fire.

[c] Matt. : 59.

55 [c]And the chief priests and all the council sought for witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found none.

56 For many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together.

57 And there arose certain, and

---

suggestion that the youth was St. Mark himself; this would account both for his mentioning the circumstance—not one of general interest—and for his not mentioning the name. St. Mark was then a young man; we find him soon afterwards residing in Jerusalem with his mother, whose house at a very early time was the home, so to speak, of the Church: cf. Acts xii. 12 and 25. The disciples met there for prayer, nor is it improbable that in it was the upper room associated with the dearest reminiscences of Christians. The youth was following, or, as the word (συνηκολούθει, Tisch.) denotes, accompanying, Him; that is, he came with the disciples, as it would seem, from the house, where they had partaken of the Last Supper. He could not, therefore, as some conjecture, have been already in the neighbourhood of the garden. He must have left the house in haste, roused apparently from his bed (Bengel, Weiss), not having time to dress, but merely wrapping himself loosely in a fine linen cloth (sindon), probably a light thin wrapper, such as is used in the East, thrown over him on his pallet. This proves that he belonged to an opulent family; the "sindon" was not used by the lower or even middle classes. Bengel, "locuples igitur erat." The guards attempted to seize him, but he left his covering in their hands and fled away, either in his under tunic or, more probably, naked. These details harmonise with what we know of St. Mark's position and character.

Other suggestions have been made, some very improbable. Thus Ewald supposes it may have been Saul, drawn by curiosity.

*and the young men laid hold on him.*] Or, according to the oldest MSS, *and they lay hold on him:* but there is good authority for retaining *the young men*, i.e. the attendants. The tendency to omission in the two oldest MSS is well known.

53–65. The Trial of our Lord.

**53.** *to the high priest.*] Caiaphas, named here by St. Matthew. The houses of Caiaphas and Annas, his father-in-law, were probably near the Temple and contiguous; unless indeed, Annas, the real head of the family, occupied a portion of the official residence of the high priest. St. John, who says that Jesus was first led to Annas, describes the trial as taking place in the palace of Caiaphas: see ch. xviii. verses 13, 14, 28. The meetings of the Sanhedrim, especially for informal or preliminary inquiries, were often held there.

*and the scribes.*] Last mentioned, but with emphasis, see note on verse 1.

**54.** *even into the palace.*] Rather, "even **into the court.**" The court in the interior of a great house was used on public occasions for meetings of guests and for the reception of attendants. In this case the whole body of guards, with the slaves of the high-priests, were there; and it being now past midnight they lighted a fire, both for warmth and light. Bengel, as usual, concise and true, "apte lux pro igni dicitur, ad lucem agnitus est Petrus, qui alias tutior fuisset." Cf. Luke xxii. 56. The meeting of the Sanhedrim was probably in a large room, not open to the public, within the palace; so that St. Peter, sitting in the court, would not see the proceedings. Thus, as St. Matthew says, he waited to see, not the process, but the end. The representation of the Apostle sitting among the slaves, chilled through and through and seeking to warm himself, notwithstanding the danger to which the light exposed him, is thoroughly in St. Mark's style; he must often have heard St. Peter's own account of this terrible overthrow.

**56.** *but their witness agreed not together.*] Or, "**and their testimonies were not alike:**" they did not tally. The witnesses would be called in one by one, and examined separately (a proof that the court was not held in sight, or within hearing, of the crowd in the hall), and unless two at least concurred substantially in their statements their evidence could not be legally received. Numbers were now called, from whom the Sanhedrim hoped to elicit grounds for legal condemnation.

**57.** *there arose certain.*] This implies that, on hearing of the failure, some—St. Matthew

bare false witness against him, saying,

58 We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands.

59 But neither so did their witness agree together.

60 And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? what *is it which* these witness against thee?

61 But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?

62 And Jesus said, I am: [d] and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

[d] Matt. 24. 30.

63 Then the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What need we any further witnesses?

64 Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death.

65 And some began to spit on him,

---

says, two—came forward spontaneously and bore conflicting witness; in fact, their words, as they are reported in the two Evangelists, differ materially. St. Mark has "*I* (emphatic), *even I, will destroy;*" St. Matthew, "I am able to destroy;" St. Mark, again, "*this temple made with hands;*" St. Matthew, "the temple of God;" St. Mark, "*I will build another not made with hands;*" St. Matthew, "I will build it," *i. e.* the same temple referred to.

There can be no doubt that both witnesses knew something about the words of our Lord recorded by St. John ii. 19–21; but it is evident that they either relied upon the accounts of others or had a very imperfect remembrance. Had the words which St. Mark gives been correctly reported by both, there would have been legal ground for condemnation. German critics, judging, as usual, from subjective impressions, hold, some that St. Matthew (Meyer), others that St. Mark, has the original and genuine tradition; but it is obvious that two accounts of contradictory evidence might naturally differ, nor is there any internal ground for rejecting either account as incorrect. The coincidence between St. John and the two Synoptists is striking.

**60.** *in the midst.*] Or, "**into the middle:**" *i.e.* the high priest, leaving his official seat, came forward into the middle of the semicircle, in which the members of the Sanhedrim were seated. The accused stood facing them, so that the high priest was then immediately side by side with our Lord. He stood doubtless, like the accuser in Zechariah, ch. iii. 1, at His right hand.

The first object of Caiaphas was to draw out an answer to the allegations, which, as he well knew, would not suffice, as they then stood, for condemnation. Had our Lord answered, it must have been either to deny that He had uttered the words, which would have involved a long and captious investigation, since they were in part correctly reported; or to explain them, a course equally unadvisable, for it is certain they would not have accepted any statement on His part as to the meaning. Silence was at once the wisest and most dignified mode of dealing with vague and inconsistent charges.

**61.** *Again the high priest asked him.*] St. Mark omits the solemn adjuration (see Matt. xxvi. 63), which is important as shewing the practice of the Jewish court, and as drawing forth words which, among other far higher points, recognise the legality of oaths.

**62.** *I am.*] St. Matthew, "thou hast said": equivalent expressions.

This verse favours the allegorical interpretation of ch. xiii. 26. The manifestation would be within the lifetime of some at least of the hearers, which is literally true if it refers to the establishment and spread of the Church.

**63.** *his clothes, &c.*] Rather, **his tunics.** People of rank frequently wore two tunics, the inner one of fine linen, the outer one much longer (called מעיל). This was, however, regarded as a luxurious or ostentatious habit. See Lightfoot, Winer, s. v. Kleidung; Joseph. Ant. xvii. 5, 7.

Caiaphas, a thoroughly irreligious man, was at least a consummate actor; this act illustrates the term (ὑποκριτής) which, applied by our Lord, had roused the deadly malice of the Jewish leaders.

**64.** *And they all.*] It may therefore be inferred that none had been summoned who were known or suspected to favour our Lord; though they may have been called to the more formal council at daybreak, when alone sentence of death could be legally pronounced. Two at least were not consenting to His death. They would certainly not be parties to the irregular proceedings in the house of Caiaphas.

**65.** *and to cover his face.*] In bitter derision of His claims, whether as a prophet, or as the Christ. They called upon Him to tell

and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy: and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands.

[e Matt. 26. 69.] 66 ¶ [e]And as Peter was beneath in the palace, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest:

67 And when she saw Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and said, And thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth.

68 But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew.

69 And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, This is *one* of them.

70 And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art *one* of them: for thou art a Galilæan, and thy speech agreeth *thereto*.

71 But he began to curse and to swear, *saying*, I know not this man of whom ye speak.

72 [f]And the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And [1]when he thought thereon, he wept.

[f Matt. 26. 75.] [1 Or, *he wept abundantly*, or *he began to weep*.]

---

them by a supernatural intuition who struck Him; if he were unable to do that, how could He know the great events of futurity? The malice was not therefore merely idle mockery; it had a serious intent; it would supply an argument by which some waverers might be moved.

*and the servants, &c.*] St. Mark, who alone notices the insults immediately afterwards heaped upon Him by the slaves, uses, according to one reading of the text, a Latin idiom, verberibus eum acceperunt. This seems to have occurred when He was handed over to them without, in the hall. See the next note. Then first He was in the same place with Peter.

66–72. ST. PETER'S DENIALS.

**66.** *beneath in the palace.*] Or **below in the court**. St. Matthew, *without in the hall.* The chamber in which the Sanhedrim met was an upper room.

**68.** *neither understand I.*] St. Mark is careful to give every word; even this slight addition aggravates St. Peter's sin.

*And he went out into the porch.*] The exact place designated was a small forecourt in the open air. There the crowing of the cock might be heard more easily than in the inner court; this crowing was about one or two o'clock,—see note on v. 30—some three or four hours before the second crowing, giving therefore some intimation as to the length of the proceedings. According to a late Jewish tradition cocks were not kept in Jerusalem, being considered unclean; but there are distinct proofs to the contrary in the Talmud.

*and the cock crew.*] This is omitted by ℵ B, but is found in MSS of the highest authority, and in most ancient versions. It should certainly be retained: see *v.* 72, where *the second time* is omitted by ℵ, as all critics hold, wrongly.

**69.** *And a maid.*] This might give an impression that the same maid is meant; but St. Peter was then near the gate or outer door, and the person who would naturally see him was the portress. We know from St. John, ch. xviii. 16, that a female kept the door. She could speak positively to his identity. Then came the second denial. There was an interval, it might be of two hours, between this and the preceding denial: another interval of about an hour (Luke *v.* 59) passes, and the bystanders, who had been present at the arrest, one recognising him as the smiter of Malchus, unanimously charged him.

**71.** *curse and to swear.*] St. Matthew has the same strong expression, which St. Luke, the *Pauline Evangelist*, omits. But St. Mark adds a few sharp painful words, *this* (contemptuous), and the expression, "whom ye speak" of, as though he knew Him only from their statement.

The oldest MSS have *immediately* before *the second time*, which one, ℵ, omits.

**72.** *the second time.*] This was about an hour before dawn. The trial was then just over: our Lord was now in the court passing towards the porch, bound and in the hands of the attendants, and turned, as St. Luke alone tells us, to cast a look on the denier. That look St. Peter could not forget, but he might hardly bear to speak of it; it told too of unbroken affection, and that in relating his own great sin he might scarcely dare to record. What he does relate is the sudden reaction at the second cock-crowing, "and when he thought thereon he wept"—he will not even dwell on the *bitterness* of his anguish, which the other Synoptists record with natural sympathy. He omits also the words, "he went out." He will say nothing of him-

## CHAPTER XV.

1 *Jesus brought bound, and accused before Pilate. Upon the clamour of the common people, the murderer Barabbas is loosed, and Jesus delivered up to be crucified.* 17 *He is crowned with thorns,* 19 *spit on, and mocked:* 21 *fainteth in bearing his cross:* 27 *hangeth between two thieves:* 29 *suffereth the triumphing reproaches of the Jews:* 39 *but confessed by the centurion to be the Son of God:* 43 *and is honourably buried by Joseph.*

g Matt. 27. 1.

AND [g] straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried *him* away, and delivered *him* to Pilate.

2 And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering said unto him, Thou sayest *it*.

3 And the chief priests accused him of many things: but he answered nothing.

h Matt. 27. 13.

4 [h] And Pilate asked him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they witness against thee.

5 But Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled.

6 Now at *that* feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired.

7 And there was *one* named Barabbas, *which lay* bound with them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed murder in the insurrection.

8 And the multitude crying aloud began to desire *him to do* as he had ever done unto them.

9 But Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews?

10 For he knew that the chief priests had delivered him for envy.

11 But the chief priests moved the people, that he should rather release Barabbas unto them.

---

self save what concerned the greatness of his fall, and the simple fact of his grief (a long weeping, ἔκλαιε, not ἔκλαυσε) on the awakening of conscience. The rendering "when he thought thereon," is correct; the Greek word implies exactly that when he turned his thought, and recalled those words, he began to weep, and continued weeping. Other explanations are doubtful and unsatisfactory. N.B. Grimm (Lex. *s. v.*) gives good authority for this (Antonin. 10, 30; Plut. Plac. Phil. 4, 1), and adds, "absol. ἐπιβαλών, sc. τῷ ῥήματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, quum perpendisset effatum Christi." Rather, "quum animum advertisset ad effatum Jesu."

Thus terminates the preliminary inquiry. The sentence of death is not pronounced in a formal and legal way, but the decision that death was the proper penalty has been given; the only question that remains is how it is to be executed. On the illegality of the whole proceeding, see note on Matt. xxvii. 1.

### CHAP. XV.—1–14. THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE.

**3.** *but he answered nothing.*] These words are omitted in all the best MSS. They were probably inserted as a gloss from the margin.

**4.** *they witness against thee.*] Or, *accuse thee of.* So four of the oldest MSS. The received text may be taken from Matt. xxvii. 13; but the authorities are divided.

**8.** *crying aloud.*] This follows the received text; but another reading is more probable, "coming up," *i.e.* to the governor's palace from all parts of the town, apparently for the express purpose of claiming the usual privilege. Thus it happened that the final trial of our Lord took place in the presence of a multitude, which represented not only the whole population of Jerusalem, but the nation generally.

**9.** It is doubtful whether Pilate counted on the choice of the people falling upon Jesus; but, as the verse following proves, he expected that at least a very large party would declare in His favour, since the *envy* of the chief priests had special reference to our Lord's popularity.

*Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews?*] The question was put in an insidious form. It implies that Pilate knew that the people would generally recognise Him by that title; and it reminded them that within six days they had publicly acknowledged Him as the true King. Yet there was a grim irony, characteristic of the Roman, which Pilate with his usual levity could not repress. "The king! here you see him, a prisoner in chains!"

**10.** *the chief priests.*] Not here expressly named by St. Matthew.

**11.** *moved the people.*] The word is more emphatic than that used by St. Matthew: it implies energetic and successful efforts to

12 And Pilate answered and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do *unto him* whom ye call the King of the Jews?

13 And they cried out again, Crucify him.

14 Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him.

15 ¶ And *so* Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged *him*, to be crucified.

16 And the soldiers led him away into the hall, called Prætorium; and they call together the whole band.

17 And they clothed him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about his *head*,

18 And began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews!

19 And they smote him on the head with a reed, and did spit upon him, and bowing *their* knees worshipped him.

20 And when they had mocked him, they took off the purple from him, and put his own clothes on him, and led him out to crucify him.

21 [a]And they compel one Simon a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear his cross.

[a] Matt. 27. 32.

---

shake the people, to stir up their worst passions. Doubtless, as might be inferred from verse 29, the charge which was urged most effectually was that He had threatened to destroy the Temple. That would militate against the feelings of many who had seen in Him for a time the true Messiah. The fearful humiliation to which He had been subjected would be represented as a just punishment for such an offence. So the chief priests succeeded: the people ratified their sentence.

**13.** *And they cried out again.*] This to some extent might seem to confirm the reading adopted in our A.V. in verse 8; but it probably refers to verse 11.

**15.** *to content.*] Or, **to satisfy**. The statement is important, as shewing that Pilate did this avowedly not as recognising the justice of the doom, but to meet the popular wish. See note on St. Matt. xxvii. 31. The death of an obscure provincial, especially when a plausible account was forthcoming, would be a trifle in his eyes. N.B. St. Mark again uses a Latin idiom, common in Greek writers who were conversant with Latin, *e.g.*, Polybius and Appian. See Wetstein. Thus, too, Hermas, 'Sim.' v. § 4, bis. Hermas has many reminiscences of this gospel.

16–20. THE MOCKING.

**16.** *into the hall, called Prætorium.*] Literally, "into the court which is the Prætorium." The expression is peculiar. The "court," or "hall," is apparently identified with the Prætorium, *i. e.* the official residence of the Procurator, representing the emperor, and in that capacity occupying a military palace. See notes on St. Matthew xxvii. 2. Here the commentators differ. The hall is held by some to be the great court of the residence, round which the soldiers had their quarters. It is, however, questionable whether the word used by St. Mark means court or palace. Grimm gives the latter as the idiomatic meaning: "Ædes ipsæ, palatium," referring to Matt. xxvi. 3, 56; Mark xiv. 54; xv. 16; Luke xi. 4; John xviii. 15; adding, "et ita persæpe ap. Græcos inde ab Hom. Odys. iv. 74." Josephus uses the word frequently in this sense, and it would naturally be so understood by St. Mark's readers.

**17.** *clothed him with purple.*] St. Matthew, "a scarlet robe." Words of colour, and specially "purple," are generally indefinite even in classical writers. There can be no doubt that the vestment, the red cloak of the soldiers, was intended to represent the purple robe of royalty.

21–41. THE CRUCIFIXION.

**21.** *Simon.*] The few particulars related of this Simon are interesting. He was a Cyrenian, a dweller in a city where there was a considerable Jewish settlement—probably, therefore, himself a merchant. He came to Jerusalem for the festival, but passed the night, as was usual (see Caspari, L. J.), in the adjoining country. St. Mark mentions his two sons, Alexander and Rufus; both, therefore, must have been well known, probably as residents at Rome, where St. Mark wrote. Rufus is mentioned by St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 13); both he and his mother were specially dear to that Apostle: "Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord, and his mother, and mine." A Rufus is named by St. Polycarp ('Ad Phil. § 9) as an eminent martyr. It may be inferred that Simon was a man of some position and personally known to St. Mark, who

22 And they bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull.

23 And they gave him to drink wine mingled with myrrh: but he received *it* not.

24 And when they had crucified him, they parted his garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take.

25 And it was the third hour, and they crucified him.

26 And the superscription of his accusation was written over, THE KING OF THE JEWS.

27 And with him they crucify two thieves; the one on his right hand, and the other on his left.

28 And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, [b] And he was numbered with the transgressors.

[b] Isai. 53. 12.

29 And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ah, thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest *it* in three days,

30 Save thyself, and come down from the cross.

31 Likewise also the chief priests mocking said among themselves with the scribes, He saved others; himself he cannot save.

32 Let Christ the King of Israel descend now from the cross, that we may see and believe. And they that were crucified with him reviled him.

33 And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour.

34 And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, [c] Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

[c] Matt. 27. 46.

---

may have met him at Jerusalem or at Rome; hence the natural conjecture of Origen that he was converted by our Evangelist. The Cross which he was compelled to bear after Jesus (cf. Luke xxiii. 26) was taken to his heart.

**22.** *they bring him.*] Literally, they "**bear him.**" The word is nearly equivalent to *lead*, but in other passages where it occurs in this gospel it generally implies infirmity or dependence in the person brought. Hence it has been reasonably inferred that our Lord was then sinking under the weight of the cross, especially since St. Mark changes the expression: in verse 20 we read "they led Him out;" here "they bear Him."

**23.** *And they gave . . . myrrh.*] Or **they offered** (not gave, but "would give"). The wine mingled with myrrh was certainly offered as a strong narcotic, such as pitying Hebrew women provided for the crucified; see note on St. Matthew.

**25.** *the third hour.*] 9 A.M. If we take this as an exact note of time, three hours only would have been occupied by the final decision of the Sanhedrim, and the trials before Herod Antipas and Pilate. St. Mark may, however, mean the division of the day beginning with the third hour, and extending to noonday. Augustin (Cons. 3. 40) holds that the "third hour" refers to the time when the Jews cried out, "Crucify him!"—"Veracissime demonstratur tunc eos crucifixisse quando clamaverunt; maxime quia nolebant videri se hoc fecisse." Tischendorf quotes a scholion to the same effect. Jerome thinks that "third" was an error for sixth (*i. e.* Γ for ϛ: "multi episemum Græcum ϛ putaverunt esse Γ"). These suggestions only prove the difficulty felt by careful readers. On St. John's "twelfth hour," apparently the Asiatic reckoning of time, see note on John xix. 14.

**26.** *The king of the Jews.*] The shortest, and therefore most probably the Latin, superscription, "Rex Judæorum;" as usual concise and pointed, telling all in two words.

**28.** *and the scripture was fulfilled.*] This verse is omitted in the oldest MSS, including the Alexandrian, and in recent editions. It is supposed to be taken from Luke xxii. 37; but it differs from other passages to which such an observation may apply, being connected with another context. Here it has a special propriety, as shewing that the ignominy, to which our Lord was then subjected, had been contemplated in the eternal counsels of God. It has the support of a great majority of MSS, 17 uncials, of the ancient Versions, and of early Fathers.

**34.** *Eloi, Eloi.*] It is somewhat remarkable that St. Mark gives the Aramaic form more exactly than St. Matthew. It is thus usual with St. Mark, on solemn occasions, to cite the very words spoken by our Lord. The form of the word here used favours the supposition that the bystanders spoke in mere mockery. Eloi could hardly be mistaken for Elias, though Eli might.

35 And some of them that stood by, when they heard *it*, said, Behold, he calleth Elias.

36 And one ran and filled a spunge full of vinegar, and put *it* on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, Let alone; let us see whether Elias will come to take him down.

37 And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost.

38 And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.

39 ¶ And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God.

40 There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome;

41 (Who also, when he was in Galilee, [d] followed him, and ministered unto him;) and many other women which came up with him unto Jerusalem.

42 ¶ [e] And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath,

43 Joseph of Arimathæa, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus.

44 And Pilate marvelled if he were

[d] Luke 8. 3.
[e] Matt. 27. 57.

---

**36.** *Let alone.*] St. Mark gives the soldier's own words, spoken probably in answer to his comrades; see Matt. xxvii. 49.

**37.** *cried . . . and gave up the ghost.*] Or, "uttering a loud voice, expired;" the last outcry and the last breath were simultaneous.

**39.** *which stood over against him.*] It was the special duty of the centurion to watch the fulfilment of the sentence; he was, therefore, stationed immediately in front of our Lord. There he could hear the last word, evidently not an inarticulate cry, but full of meaning, represented by St. John as τετέλεσται, by St. Luke more fully, "Father into Thy hand I commend my spirit;" unless, as is more probable, those words immediately preceded the last cry. It is very striking that our Evangelist attributes the conviction of the centurion to the effect produced by this voice, in which he must therefore have recognised a personal manifestation of character. His words seem to refer to that of our Lord, recorded by St. Luke —"Father;" this must be the "Son." The word "so cried out" is supposed (Weiss, Tischendorf) to be interpolated from St. Matthew; but it is retained by most critics and has ample authority. Whether expressed or not, a word referring to the cry must be understood.

**41.** *when he was in Galilee.*] A point not so clearly stated by the other Evangelists. It refers to a long and loving service during our Lord's ministry in Galilee. We have thus *two* groups of women—those who formed part of His habitual attendants, and others who accompanied Him on His last journey.

*many other women.*] The presence of *many other women* must be specially noted, since it bears upon the question of divers appearances after the Resurrection. St. Luke adds, "all his acquaintances."

### 42–47. The Burial.

**43.** *an honourable counsellor.*] "Honourable" may be a conventional term, equivalent to our "worshipful:" but it probably implies that Joseph held a leading position in the Sanhedrim.

*waited for the kingdom of God.*] St. Matthew "was Jesus' disciple."

*came . . . in boldly.*] Or, **took courage and came in.** St. Mark thus calls our attention to the boldness of the act. He connects it apparently with Joseph's going into the palace of Pilate, a man of hasty and fierce passions, not unlikely to resent an application which might compromise him as a favourer of the Crucified; but it is more probable that the word refers to previous timidity, avouched by St. John xix. 38, and indicated by the words "which also," or "who himself also," implying that he was one with Christ's followers in spirit, not in profession. It is certain that the application would at once bring on him the fierce enmity of the Jews, specially of the Sanhedrim, which, in the 'Acts of Pilate,' ch. xii. is represented as imprisoning him for this act.

**44.** *marvelled.*] This notice is peculiar to St. Mark. Pilate expected that death would not come on before the hour when the soldiers would break the legs of the crucified: he sent, therefore, for the centurion. The place of execution—whichever residence may be

already dead: and calling *unto him* the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead.

45 And when he knew *it* of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph.

46 And he bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre.

47 And Mary Magdalene and Mary *the mother* of Joses beheld where he was laid.

## CHAPTER XVI.

1 *An angel declareth the resurrection of Christ to three women.* 9 *Christ himself appeareth to Mary Magdalene:* 12 *to two going into the country:* 14 *then to the apostles,* 15 *whom he sendeth forth to preach the gospel:* 19 *and ascendeth into heaven.*

AND when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the *mother* of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him.

2 *f* And very early in the morning the first *day* of the week, they came

*f* Luke 24. 1. John 20. 1.

---

assigned to Pilate—was not one-third of a mile distant.

45. *he gave the body.*] A slight, but significant change of expression in the Greek brings out the difference between the feelings of Joseph and Pilate. Joseph asked for the *body;* Pilate gave him the *corpse* (πτῶμα), a word corresponding exactly to "cadaver." The word "gave," or presented, seems to imply that Pilate gave it up without receiving a bribe: an unusual act for him, which may imply some remains of the feelings which had led him to resist the demands of our Lord's enemies.

CHAP. XVI.—1–8. APPEARANCE OF AN ANGEL TO THE HOLY WOMEN.

1. *when the sabbath was past.*] The Sabbath ended at sunset on Saturday. They rested the Sabbath day; immediately after its legal termination they purchased the spices.

*had bought . . . spices.*] Rather, "**bought spices,**" omitting "had." Our translators evidently identified these three holy women with the others "who came with Him from Galilee," and prepared "spices and ointments" on Friday evening, in the short interval between the entombment and sunset: cf. Luke xxiii. 55, 56. St. Mark's account is precise. Mary Magdalene, the other Mary, and Salome did not purchase the spices, which they brought with them, before the evening of Saturday. Our Evangelist does not mention by name Joanna (see Luke xxiv. 10), nor Susanna, nor the other women who came with them from Galilee.

We have, therefore, clear indications of two separate groups; nor is it difficult to account for their separation. The home of Salome would naturally be the house occupied by Zebedee and her sons, which, as Caspari has shewn, was in Jerusalem; the traditional site—by no means an improbable one—is near the gate Gennath, not far from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Joanna, on the contrary, would, of course, reside with her husband Chuza, steward to Herod, who at that time occupied the Asmonean Palace on Mount Sion. Thus Joanna and her companions, including probably Susanna (cf. Luke viii. 3) would be at a greater distance from the scene of the entombment; and though they set out, as St. Luke says (ch. xxiv. 1), very early (ὄρθρου βαθέως), they probably reached it somewhat later than the others. It may be worth notice that St. Mark, deriving his information from St. Peter, who certainly was with St. John, and probably in his house that morning (see John xx. 2), would be more specially informed as to the proceedings of Salome and her connections: whereas on the other hand St. Luke, on several occasions, shews himself to be specially conversant with matters touching Herod's household: cf. Luke viii. 3; xxiii. 8–12.

*and anoint him.*] The expression is strictly correct; the sweet spices were scented unguents. This is evident from the act of Mary and our Lord's words at Bethany, ch. xiv. 8. The process of anointing the Body would be commenced when the large linen cloth, with the hundred pounds' weight of aloes and myrrh (cf. John xix. 39), was unfolded. The first process must have been hurried; enough had then been done to preserve the mangled Body from the rapid progress of corruption. What remained now to be done was slow, careful, tender disposal in the Tomb.

2. *And very early . . . they came.*] Or, **and very early on the first day** (lit. on day one) **of the week they come;** *i.e.* they are on the way. The change of tense "come," not "came," is here of importance.

unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.

3 And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?

4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great.

[g] John 20. 11.

5 [g] And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted.

6 And he saith unto them, Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him.

7 But go your way, tell his dis-

---

It separates the time from that noted in the preceding verse, as is invariably the usage of St. Mark when he has the historical present. They bought the spices, as we have seen, on the Saturday evening; they set out the next morning and arrived at the sepulchre very early—not, however, as our A. V. has, *at the rising of the sun*, but **after sunrise**; literally, "the sun having risen."

3. *And they said among themselves.*] Or, **and they were saying to one another.** This notice is characteristic of St. Mark, graphic and true to nature. The difficulty was a very serious one. The stone, as St. Mark observes in the next verse in reference to this questioning, was very great. They had seen it rolled to the entrance, an aperture of at least three or four feet in height and two or three in breadth, and it would take two or three men to move it. They do not speak of guards, not having heard of the precaution which the high priest's party had taken, probably on the afternoon of the Sabbath, when they would themselves be resting in their own home.

4. *And when they looked.*] Rather, "**and looking up.**" They had gone with downcast eyes, sorrowing and anxious; but when they came to the spot where they could see the Tomb, they looked up, and saw that the stone was rolled away. Here it is important to bear in mind the form of tombs common in Palestine. If they were of any considerable size, belonging to rich families, such as that of Joseph of Arimathea, there was generally a vestibule or corridor in front open to the air (see note on Matt. xxvii. 60). Thus in the Holy Sepulchre, the antechamber, called the Angel's Chapel, is 17 feet in length. Through such a vestibule the entrance to the chamber of sepulture would be visible at some distance. They looked to that at once, having their minds full of the difficulty, and saw that the stone had been removed. So they went on, relieved from that anxiety, to which St. Mark again calls attention, adding, "for it (the stone) was very great." It is to be inferred from St. John's account (ch. xx. 2) that, on seeing the entrance open, Mary Magdalene went away at once to call St. Peter and St. John.

5. *And entering into the sepulchre.*] The word sepulchre applies to the whole structure, including the antechamber. On entering this they would first find the stone, which had been rolled away, lying outside the mortuary chamber, close by the entrance. On that stone they saw "a young man sitting," as described by St. Matthew (xxviii. 2). St. Mark mentions "the long white garment," *i. e.* the *Talar*, which (as Weiss observes) indicated a heavenly Being, none other wearing such a vestment; but he does not speak of the flashing light which had prostrated the guards, either because at the appearance to the holy women that excessive splendour had passed away, or, it may be, because it suffices him to notice its effect in their amazement.

*they were affrighted.*] Such alarm is elsewhere represented as the first effect of a manifestation of heavenly Spirits. Cf. Jud. xvii. 20; Dan. x. 9; Luke i. 12; ii. 9; Rev. i. 17. The word is that which St. Mark uses in extreme cases of mental perturbation: cf. ix. 15; xiv. 33.

6. *Be not affrighted.*] Such a command involves a promise; it is a stronger word than that used by St. Matthew, who does not mention the exceeding terror just spoken of by St. Mark. The rapid, abrupt succession of short sentences, without any connecting particles, such as we find in the other Evangelists, is peculiarly striking: "Fear not—ye seek—He is not here—He is risen—He is not here—see the place." This construction is continued to the end of the angel's address in the verse following.

*Ye seek.*] St. Matthew connects this with the injunction, "Fear not, for I know," &c. *Your* motives are such as a heavenly Being cannot but approve.

*Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified.*] The original, more concisely and forcibly, **Jesus the Nazarene the crucified.**

*behold the place.*] The angel thus points to the mortuary chamber, or to the recess described in the note on Matt. xxvii. 60. St. Matthew inserts the word "come," from which it must be inferred that the women were bidden either to enter into the inner

ciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, [h]as he said unto you.

[h] Matt. 26. 32.

8 And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any *man;* for they were afraid.

9 ¶ Now when *Jesus* was risen early the first *day* of the week, [i]he

[i] John 20. 14.

---

chamber, or to look into it and see the actual spot of the entombment. The two accounts thus complete and explain each other.

7. *and Peter.*] This special notice of St. Peter is certainly not intended as a mark of pre-eminence (this would require the reverse order—"Peter and the disciples;" not "the disciples and Peter"): but it as certainly implies that there was a reason why he should receive a distinct intimation; that reason being, in all probability, the state of despondency into which he had been plunged (ch. xiv. 72), and from which he would not recover in the interval preceding the Resurrection. The Pauline Evangelist, St. Luke ch. xxiv. 34, and St. Paul himself (1 Cor. xv. 5), record the personal appearance of our Lord to St. Peter before the other Apostles. Here a message only sent through women is recorded. The insertion of this notice, and the omission of the more honourable one, are alike characteristic of the Petrine Gospel.

*as he said.*] The reference to ch. xiv. 28, assures the correctness of this reading. Some few MSS have "as I said," probably in order to harmonise the account with St. Matthew, who assigns the notice of Galilee to the angel. St Mark's statement is more complete; but St. Matthew could not have used the same expression without giving an explanation, such as would not accord with his style. St. Peter would naturally dwell on the fulfilment of a promise which had been given at a time when it had been specially needed. It recalled his own failing and his Master's goodness, see xiv. 27, 28.

8. *quickly.*] This word is omitted in nearly all good MSS, and is inserted probably from St. Matthew.

*they trembled and were amazed.*] Lit. **trembling held them and amazement.** The first word agrees exactly with St. Matthew's "with fear," but, as usual, is graphic: the trembling took possession of them, they were seized with a fit of trembling. The second word "amazement," or more literally "ecstasy," occurs but rarely in the N. T.: once in this Gospel, ch. v. 42; once in St. Luke, ch. v. 26; four times in the Acts, ch. iii. 10, x. 10, xi. 5, xxii. 17. In the last three passages it represents a state of trance, but in all the others a state of mental excitement, as of one beside himself, produced, however, in each case, not by mere alarm, but by the contemplation of supernatural power, manifested in acts of mercy and goodness. Thus too the corresponding verb, cf. Mark ii. 12; v. 42; Luke viii. 56. Such a state involves an undercurrent of joy; and if so, although St. Mark's description differs from St. Matthew's, inasmuch as it gives prominence to the disturbance of spirit, it agrees with it substantially. The bewilderment, passing away, would leave the mind full of the joy inseparable from the assurance that Christ was risen, though so long as it lasted it incapacitated them for action; hence the following statement.

*neither said they any thing . . . were afraid.*] Or, **and they said nothing to any one, for they were in a state of fear.** St. Mark describes the immediate effect; while the terror and ecstasy lasted they could not do what they were bid. It is the first introductory account of the various effects produced by the appearances after the Resurrection. It is not stated that they did not go with the intention of telling the disciples what they had seen and heard; on the contrary, we are told that they were disabled by their fear St. Matthew records a second appearance, evidently after they were rejoined by Mary Magdalene and the other holy women, which enabled them to fulfil their mission.

It is certain that had St. Mark broken off his narrative at this point, as is assumed by the generality of modern critics, he would have left his readers in a state of complete perplexity. A great scholar observes: "Who can really believe that a book ever ended with the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ?" Thus, too, Renan: "On ne peut guère admettre que le texte primitif finit d'une manière aussi abrupte" ('Les Evangiles,' p. 121). The evidences in support of the following verses will be stated in a supplementary Note. No rational account has been given of the Evangelist's motives for omitting all notice of the appearances after the Resurrection, on which the Apostles relied entirely for the proof of their fundamental doctrine.

9–13. TWO APPEARANCES OF OUR LORD PREVIOUS TO THAT VOUCHSAFED TO THE APOSTLES.

This section marks a distinct advance; our Lord Himself appears, the result being, not mere fear, but full conviction in those who saw Him; but it marks, as distinctly, a result as yet incomplete, such conviction

[k] Luke 8. 2.

appeared first to Mary Magdalene, [k]out of whom he had cast seven devils.

10 *And* she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept.

11 And they, when they had heard

---

being confined in the first instance to the witnesses themselves.

(1.) THE APPEARANCE TO MARY MAGDALENE.

**9.** *Now when Jesus was risen.*] Render "**but having risen**, early the first day of the week He appeared first to Mary Magdalene." The word "now" does not give the force of the conjunction "**but**," which connects the clause very closely with that which precedes it. The women, in their terror at the appearance of an angel, told no one; but when Jesus Himself appeared to Mary Magdalene she went and told the disciples. The transition is rapid, and abrupt, but singularly striking and characteristic of this Evangelist's narrative. Here two points call for special notice:—(1.) The mark of time is evidently given to shew that the appearance took place on the same morning as that already recorded. The repetition of the statement that it was the first day of the week is in accordance with the style of the Evangelist. Thus, too, St. John, ch. xx. 19, after saying "on that day"—which might seem to say all that was needed—adds, "on the first day of the week;" evidently for the same reason which must have induced St. Mark to add it here. Such repetitions have, indeed, been shewn by Holtzmann and others to be specially characteristic of this Gospel. (2.) Stress has been laid on a slight difference of idiom. In verse 2 (see note), the Greek has the Hebrew idiom; here St. Mark has what may be called the Latin idiom (πρώτῃ σαββάτου), corresponding to "prima Sabbati." This variation, however, is a mark of genuineness. In the first verse St. Mark would naturally adopt the form which he found in the Apostolic tradition, whether oral or written. Here writing a brief summary, he would not less naturally use the form familiar to him in addressing Latin readers. See Burgon on the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel, pp. 148–150; a work to which frequent reference will be made in these notes.

The appearance to Mary Magdalene agrees substantially with St. John's account; but it is recorded in the fewest possible words, and it contains a new statement; this is in accordance with St. Mark's method throughout this concluding portion of his gospel, a method equally characteristic of the introductory portion, ch. i. 1–39.

St. Mark, however, does not explain how it happened that Mary Magdalene was alone when she saw the Saviour: that we learn from St. John.

*out of whom He had cast seven devils.*] St. Luke notices this fact (ch. viii. 2) which is not elsewhere recorded: there is no indication of it in St. John's narrative. St. Mark, who is always careful to notice such details, has here a special reason for recording it, since it suggests a reason for the selection of Mary: none had suffered more, none had received greater blessings.

**10.** *And she went and told.*] The word "and" should not have been inserted: it is absent from the best MSS, including even L, and obscures an indication of St. Mark's style, full of such rapid transitions (see *e.g.* note on verse 6). She (emphatic ἐκείνη) went straightway (such is the force of the Greek aorist πορευθεῖσα), unlike the other women, who were for a time overcome by mingled feelings. N.B. An objection is taken to this word, which in St. Mark's Gospel occurs only here and in verse 15; but our Evangelist uses its compounds frequently, and no reason can be suggested why he should not have had so very common a word at hand when it was needed. It may be observed that St. Peter uses it thrice in his first Epistle (1 Peter iii. 19, 22; iv. 3).

*them that had been with him.*] This expression is said to be peculiar, and not likely to have been used by St. Mark; but it exactly denotes the persons to whom the message was sent, not the Apostles only, but all who had accompanied our Lord in and from Galilee. "Those with Him" was their proper designation during His ministry, and is used four times by St. Mark (ch. i. 36; ii. 25; v. 40); "those who had been with Him" was a necessary modification after His death. It has, moreover, a special fitness here: they had been with Him, and therefore knew what He had said touching His death and rising again, and yet believed not.

*as they mourned and wept.*] A graphic and tender description of the disciples in their bereavement, wailing for the departed, as was the manner of devout Jews. Cf. Acts viii. 2.

**11.** *And they.*] Emphatic (κακεῖνοι), pointing back to "she" (ἐκείνη) in the preceding verse. N.B. L omits *and:* probably a true, certainly an ancient reading, and in St. Mark's style.

*when they had heard.*] Lit., "having heard," an expression equivalent to "although they heard."

that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

12 ¶ After that he appeared in another form [l]unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.

13 And they went and told *it* unto the residue: neither believed they them.

[l] Luke 24. 13.

---

*that he was alive.*] The original more vividly, **that He liveth, and was seen by her.** The idiom is characteristic of St. Mark who uses the conjunction "that" (ὅτι) when he refers to the exact words of the speaker (see Tischendorf's note on ch. iv. 21). Dean Alford objects to the Greek word (ἐθεάθη) as unusual; but the verb is used passively twice by St. Matthew (vi. 1; xxiii. 5), and, with this exception, by no other writer in the New Testament: yet no one objects to those passages. Rare words are suited to rare occasions: this word, a very solemn one, especially befits this place. See Burgon, p. 157.

*believed not.*] This statement is of extreme importance. M. Renan says, "La gloire de la résurrection appartient donc à Marie de Magdala. Après Jésus, c'est Marie qui a le plus fait pour la fondation du Christianisme. Sa grande affirmation de femme: Il est ressuscité! a été la base de la foi de l'humanité." ('Les Apôtres,' p. 13.) To this assertion St. Mark gives the answer: the disciples did not believe her until her statement was confirmed by our Lord's personal appearance. At present M. Renan denies the authenticity of the fourth Gospel: but still holds to that assertion. It is observable that no reference is made to the testimony of St. Mary Magdalene by any early advocate: St. Paul sums up the great appearances of our Lord (see 1 Cor. xv. 5-8), but omits this; so far was he from finding in it "the basis of the faith of humanity." See also Luke xxiv. 11. We have an important stage, a personal manifestation, but a preparatory stage only, proving the need of such evidence as was afterwards given.

(2.) The Appearance to two Disciples.

12. *After that.*] From St. Luke's account it may be inferred that the disciples broke up their meeting, and that some left the city hopeless and despondent, disbelieving the report of Mary Magdalene and of the other holy women, and knowing that up to that hour neither St. Peter nor St. John had seen the Lord. The extreme brevity of St. Mark's narrative does not preclude the notice of a few circumstances of some importance.

*he appeared in another form.*] St. Mark uses a different word from that in verse 9; instead of "appeared" (ἐφάνη), he has "**was manifested**" (ἐφανερώθη), a word which seems expressly chosen to shew that He was recognised at last. N.B. The word is used by St. Mark iv. 22, and by him alone among the Synoptists. This account agrees with St. Luke, sufficiently to shew that the two Evangelists derived their information from a common source; but it differs enough to shew their mutual independence. Here the discrepancy is slight, but interesting. St. Luke attributes the disciples' want of perception to a subjective condition. "Their eyes were holden," and were not "opened" until the end (cf. Luke xxiv. 16 and 31). St. Mark rather points to an objective cause, a change of outward form. Both statements must be understood in a limited sense: had our Lord shewn Himself in His usual form He would not have remained unknown so long; but though changed, the new form was one which did not prevent recognition when He willed it.

An objection is taken to the very common word rendered "another" (ἕτερος), because it does not occur elsewhere in this Gospel; but exactly the same peculiarity is found in John xix. 37, to which no one thinks of objecting, though the word is not elsewhere used by St. John, either in the Gospel, or Epistles, or the Apocalypse. (Burgon.)

*of them.*] *I.e.* of the disciples: not, however, of the eleven (see next verse), but of those to whom Mary Magdalene had told what she had seen. Cf. v. 10.

*as they walked.*] This expression allows space for the earnest discourse recorded by St. Luke, but does not suggest it: had St. Mark merely abbreviated St. Luke's account, he would scarcely have omitted to insert a word referring to such a discourse.

*and went into the country.*] Objection is again taken to the very common word rendered "went:" see note on *v.* 10. What is really noticeable is that the word rendered "country" (ἀγρός) is used elsewhere in that sense by St. Mark, and rarely by the other Evangelists.

13. *unto the residue.*] Lit., *to the rest; i.e.* of the disciples, referred to in the preceding verse.

*neither believed they them.*] St. Luke takes no notice of the effect produced by their account, but says that while they were yet speaking our Lord appeared. This does not contradict St. Mark's account: the disciples may have thought that these two were mistaken, especially considering the distance from Emmaus, the strangeness of the circumstances, and the fact that they had not at first recog-

14 ¶ [m] Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat [1] at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.

15 [n] And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.

[m] Luke 24. 36. John 20. 19.
[1] Or, together.
[n] Matt. 28. 19.

---

nised our Lord; but it is evident that the two accounts are independent, and not easily reconciled. St. Mark adheres to his main object, proving that the disciples, one and all, accepted no evidence short of a personal appearance of our Lord.

### 14. Appearance to the Eleven.

**14.** *Afterward.*] At a very late hour in the evening: after nightfall. Compare St. John xx. 19, and Luke xxiv. 29. Observe the reference to 'first' in v. 9, and, 'after these things,' in v. 12.

N.B. It is objected that "afterward" (ὕστερον) is not used elsewhere by St. Mark. St. Luke uses it twice, St. John once only. It is more to the point to observe the omission of a connecting particle, a well-known characteristic of St. Mark's style.

*he appeared.*] Or, **He was manifested**, the same word as in verse 12.

*unto the eleven.*] Add **themselves**. This word draws out the distinction more clearly: hitherto our Lord had appeared to individuals not having an official character, now at a late hour when all were assembled for the evening meal He manifests Himself to the Apostles themselves.

*and upbraided them.*] Here is a substantial agreement with St. Luke, but a striking difference in detail. St. Luke dwells on the alarm and doubts of the disciples (verses 37, 38, 44), but calls special attention to words of comfort. St. Mark gives a sharper edge to the rebuke, (upbraided, ὠνείδισεν, a very strong word), and to the charge of incredulity. They ought to have received the testimony of truthful and competent witnesses: their doubts are now removed, but only by the evidence of their senses. This statement is characteristic. St. Mark is always careful to note shortcomings of the Apostles.

The gradation from the beginning of the chapter continued through each subdivision reaches here its climax: the Evangelist now passes on to a new subject.

### 15–18. The Charge to the Apostles.

There is no intimation of an interval between the last recorded appearance and the final charge. Now it is certain that St. Mark, or indeed any one who might be assumed to have continued his narrative, knew of the journey into Galilee, to which the Evangelist refers twice, ch. xiv. 28, and in this chapter, verse 7. Place therefore must be allowed for it, either before the following charge, or before the nineteenth verse; but in the latter case the connection is distinct: the charge immediately preceded the ascension (see note on verse 19). We must therefore adopt the former alternative. It is customary both in the Old and New Testament to pass without notice over intervals, which do not enter into the writer's plan. Here we must admit that the following charge was not delivered either on the first evening, or during the stay in Galilee. It is therefore not to be identified with our Lord's words at the close of St. Matthew's Gospel, but forms part of the last discourse delivered at Bethany (cf. Luke xxiv. 50, 51; Acts i. 12).

**15.** *Go ye . . . and preach the gospel.*] The form of the command implies urgency (such is the force of the aorists πορευθέντες κηρύξατε). The commission had been given when Christ declared Himself Lord over all in heaven and in earth (Matt. xxviii. 18): power to execute it effectually, and to begin it at once, is now promised immediately before the ascension.

N.B. The expression (πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξε) occurs in St. Peter's first Epistle, iii. 19.

*into all the world.*] The previous commission was "to all the nations," *i.e.* the Gentiles (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη), Matt. xxviii. 19: here the distinction between Jews and Gentiles is effaced; the Apostles are taught to contemplate the whole world as a single field of operation.

*the gospel.*] The expression, "the Gospel," without any addition, such as "of the kingdom," or "of God," is not found in the other Evangelists ("this Gospel," St. Matt. xxvi. 13, is not an exception); but it is characteristic of St. Mark, who has it five times (i. 15, viii. 35, x. 29, xii. 10, xiv. 9).

*to every creature.*] Or, "**to the whole creation.**" This expression is used once by St. Paul (Col. i. 23), a passage which resembles this so closely as to indicate a common origin, viz. the apostolic tradition of our Lord's words. The word (κτίσις) occurs thirteen times in St. Paul's Epistles, St. Mark has it thrice, the other Evangelists not once, St. Peter twice; so that it belongs to the evidence for the authorship by St. Mark, not against it, as some have assumed.

16 He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; [b] but he that believeth not shall be damned.

[b] John 12. 48.

17 And these signs shall follow them that believe; [c] In my name shall they cast out devils; [d] they shall speak with new tongues;

[c] Acts 16. 18.
[d] Acts 2. 4.

18 [e] They shall take up serpents;

[e] Acts 28. 5.

---

**16.** *that believeth not.*] Or, **who disbelieveth.** The original implies active, not merely negative, unbelief; he that rejects the preaching of the Gospel, persisting in the unbelief which our Lord has just condemned in His disciples (cf. verses 11, 13, 14).

*shall be damned.* Or, **condemned.** This strong word has weighed heavily with many who have rejected this section of the Gospel. The word "damned" ought to be reserved exclusively for the final sentence to be pronounced on the last day. See note on Matt. xxiii. 13. The sentence, however, is incurred potentially by unbelief, both as in itself unpardonable, being a rejection of God's witness to His Son (cf. 1 John v. 10)—such is the unvarying language of holy Scripture—and as precluding a man from deliverance from a state of unpardoned sin. The word, therefore, must not be explained away; the condemnation anticipates the doom which will be incurred by persistent unbelief. Köstlin ('Evangelien,' p. 318) remarks, "The more supernatural, mighty, and divine the manifestation and work of Jesus is, the more must faith in His Gospel be required, and unbelief be punished by damnation (Verdammniss)."

**17.** *these signs, &c.*] This also incites antagonism, as a most authoritative and complete declaration of supernatural powers to be bestowed on disciples. It must, however, be admitted to be specially adapted to the occasion of its utterance. When the disciples received the final command to set out on their mission, they had the promise of external signs as credentials. The word sign (σημεῖον) is used in the New Testament in the special sense of a miracle wrought in attestation of a Divine Presence.

*shall follow them that believe.*] Or, "will go with them that have believed," will be a result of conversion. The generality, not the permanence, of the gift is implied: signs would be needed for the first establishment of the faith, which once received rests on other evidence internal and external. Cf. Greg. Naz. Or. xliii., c. 35.

The word (παρακολουθέω) is objected to, as not found elsewhere in this Gospel. St. Luke has it once only (ch. i. 3), a fact which has never suggested a doubt as to the authenticity of that passage. No word would be more suitable here. It is used by Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. §. 12, p. 228, B, in the same sense, and possibly in reference to this passage, ἐκ τῶν ἔργων καὶ ἐκ τῆς παρακολουθούσης δυνάμεως. L, however, has ἀκολουθήσει, and is supported by C; certainly a very ancient, if not the original reading.

*In my name . . . devils.*] Cf. Acts xvi. 13. It has been repeatedly shewn that the expulsion of evil spirits is specially characteristic of our Lord's work, as apprehended by St. Mark. Recognised by all the Synoptists, it is dwelt upon by our Evangelist most prominently; being the strongest proof of the supreme and absolute dominion over the spiritual world, which appertains to Him, as "Son of God" (ch. i. 1). The following remarks by a thoughtful writer are noteworthy: "The Gospel narratives of cures of the possessed seem to us especially affecting and instructive as manifestations of the Saviour in conflict with moral evil with the spiritual enemies of man. They are highly instructive in the hints they give concerning the demoniac nature, the nature of voluntary and intelligent beings utterly depraved; their dread of pain as the *summum malum;* their sole idea of God as the inflicter of pain. 'Torment us not,' is their only prayer. Their one constant craving is for the possession of living creatures whom they may degrade or destroy; if cast out of men, they beg that they may be suffered to enter into swine. The attitude also of the Saviour towards them, as described by the Evangelists, is deeply impressive; the utter abhorrence, yet absence of all inclination to torment, with the resolute purpose to deliver from them the wills which they have enslaved." 'Spectator,' July 29th, 1876, p. 956. On the importance attached to this power by the early church, see Justin Martyr, Apol. 2, § 6, with Otto's note, p. 216, ed. 3.

*they shall speak with new tongues.*] This is the first notice of a gift specially characteristic of the first outpouring of the Spirit, and it is peculiarly suitable to the occasion. Ten days afterwards the promise was fulfilled. Within a short time after the Apostle's age, the gift appears to have been withdrawn; the last notice, indeed the only one in the early Fathers, is in Irenæus, c. Hær. v. 6, § 1. Certainly no writer in the second century would have invented this promise.

**18.** *they shall take up serpents.*] At Rome the only recorded instance, that in St. Paul's history (Acts xxviii. 3-8), would be well known to St. Mark's readers. N.B. Here L has a peculiar reading, found also in C*, and undoubtedly very ancient, sc. *and in their*

and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; *f* they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

*f* Acts 28. 8.

19 ¶ So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was *g* received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.

*g* Luke 24. 51.

---

*hands*, in place of *new* in the preceding verse, sc. καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν, for καιναῖς. This is of importance as one among other indications that in this portion L followed a very old, probably the original, recension.

*any deadly thing.*] This promise stands alone: it is an instance of St. Mark's independence. A very early tradition, derived from Papias, asserts the fulfilment in the case of Justus Barsabas, cf. Euseb. H. E. iii. § 39, Eusebius treats the tradition in a manner which proves how completely the memory of such signs had died out in his time, and which may partly account for the suspicion which he first threw on this section. A legend to the same effect touching St. John is noticed by Augustine: see Hilgenfeld, Einl. p. 405.

*the sick.*] Lit., the weakly, invalids. The Greek word occurs thrice in St. Mark, elsewhere twice only in the New Testament. On the fulfilment of this promise, see Irenæus, lib. ii. 32, 4.

*shall recover.*] Lit., "be well" (καλῶς ἕξουσι). The form occurs six times in this Gospel (i. 22, 32, 34; ii. 17; vi. 55), less frequently, save in the parallel passages, in the other Gospels.

With regard to the whole of this passage, it may be confidently affirmed that no one would have interpolated it after the cessation, or infrequent occurrence, of "signs" which accompanied the first promulgation of the Gospel, that is after the first decennium of the second century. Justin Martyr scarcely notices any, excepting cures of demoniacs, attributing the success of the preaching of the Gospel to spiritual and moral influences (cf. Apol. i. § 39).

19, 20. The Ascension of Christ, and the Preaching of the Gospel.

**19.** *So then after the Lord had spoken.*] This final clause is introduced with peculiar solemnity. Irenæus quotes it twice (c. Hær. iii. ch. x., and in Cramer's Catena): that Father saw clearly the special propriety of the designation "the Lord" which is here used by St. Mark. It refers distinctly to the prophecy cited in the beginning of this Gospel, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," which Irenæus also quotes, and which unquestionably applies to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is asserted that the word is "foreign to the diction of Mark" (Alford): but in ch. ii. 28, He is the "Lord of the Sabbath;" and in ch. xi. 3, Christ saith of Himself "the Lord hath need of him." Here, moreover, the word comes naturally in connection with the reference to the 110th Psalm which follows immediately; the beginning of that Psalm, "the Lord said unto my Lord," could not but be present to the writer's mind. It had but a short time before been quoted emphatically by our Lord. See ch. xii. 36. Compare also note on Luke x. 1.

*the Lord had spoken.*] St. Mark does not add, "these things;" from which it may probably be inferred that he alludes to other words spoken at the same time (see Acts i. 8); the difference between the two accounts is this. St. Luke, both in his Gospel, and more accurately in Acts i. 8, records those words which bore upon events immediately following the ascension, especially the coming of the Holy Ghost: St. Mark closes with the announcement of what was to follow generally until the Gospel was fully promulgated.

*he was received up.*] Or, "was taken up." The same word (ἀνελήφθη) in the same connection, with a final charge to the Apostles, is used by St. Luke, Acts i. 2; in the address of the Angels, Acts i. 11; and in St. Peter's discourse, Acts i. 22: the last passage, quoted above in note on ch. i. 1, being that which exactly defines the scope and extent of this Gospel. See also 1 Tim. iii. 16.

*and sat on the right hand of God.*] Irenæus quotes this specially as a fulfilment of the prophecy in the 110th Psalm: see note above. The session at the right-hand of God is, in like manner, referred to by St. Peter (1, iii. 22), "who is gone into heaven, and is on the right-hand of God." St. Mark thus completes the task which he undertook in the beginning of his Gospel. Jesus is the Son of God. His last charge regards the whole Creation. His work is wound up, in heaven, by restoration to the Throne which was His with the Father "before the world was" (cf. John xvii. 4, 5); on earth, by the preaching of the Gospel under His abiding help.

The representations of the first two Evangelists harmonise with, and complete, each other. St. Matthew contemplates our Lord more specially as the Christ, Receiver and Depositary of all power in heaven and earth. St. Mark sees in Him more specially the Son of God, having His place at His Father's right-hand, and thence exercising supreme dominion.

20 And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with *them*, [a]and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.

[a] Heb. 2. 4.

St. Mark is sparing of direct reference to the Prophets; but he begins and closes his Gospel with distinct allusion to very important predictions, of which the application has the authority of our Lord.

**20.** *went forth, and preached every where.*] The first word, "went forth" (*ἐξελθόντες*), is that which our Evangelist generally uses in recording a departure from one place to another; here it intimates departure from the place or country in which they received the command. The three words are quoted by Justin Martyr, 'Apol.' i. 45, p. 83 (a testimony of which the force is recognised by Tischendorf); he alludes to the whole passage in three other places, 'Apol.' 1, 39, p. 78, and 49 p. 85; and c. Tryph. 53, p. 273.

## ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

### External Evidences.

1. **The evidence of ancient MSS.**—All uncial manuscripts, with three exceptions, ℵ B L, and all cursive manuscripts agree in maintaining the entire section. Such agreement is extremely rare in disputed passages, and is the more remarkable since the list comprises copies of entirely different recensions, and of different ages from the fourth century downwards.

On the other hand two manuscripts, ℵ B, admitted to be the oldest, and regarded by most critics as on the whole entitled to the greatest weight, concur in omitting the entire paragraph. When those manuscripts are supported by other old MSS, especially A C and D, by ancient versions, and by early Christian writers, their testimony is now generally accepted as conclusive. This, however, as will be presently shewn, is not the case here; their evidence, weighty as it may be, stands on its own merits; and though both omit the paragraph, their testimony is not identical. The Sinaitic Codex, ℵ, omits the passage, and leaves no place for its insertion. The Vatican Codex, B, on the other hand, in addition to the usual space after the subscription in the last column, has an entire column left blank between St. Mark and St. Luke, sufficient for the insertion of the twelve missing verses. Such a vacant space does not occur at the end of any other book in that manuscript. The natural inference is that the scribe was aware that the missing verses were extant, or even that they were present in the manuscript which he was copying, but that for some reason he refrained from transcribing them; that reason being not improbably the opinion entertained by himself, or the critic under whose authority he acted, that they were not genuine.* So far as these two manuscripts are concerned, one, the Vatican, bears indirect witness to the fact of the actual existence of the disputed passage.†

We have, however, to account for the absence of such an indication in the Sinaitic Codex. First, it must be remarked that the connexion between the two MSS is sometimes so close as to have led Tischendorf to believe that portions were written by the same scribe. The six leaves, which he selects as supplying evidence of this statement, contain the portion from Mark xvi. 2 to Luke i. 56. (See Scrivener, p. 508, note.) If this supposition be well founded, it follows that instead of two witnesses we have but one. It may also be inferred that the scribe of Codex ℵ, if he had Codex B before him, would see no sufficient reason for leaving a blank column in his copy.‡ By filling it up, however, he made a further and very serious advance in obliterating evidence.

It is held to be not improbable that both

* Thus Victor of Antioch in Cramer's 'Catenæ,' vol. i. p. 447, *ὡς νόθα νομίσαντες αὐτὰ εἶναι*. On the whole of this question the reader is referred to Burgon on the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel, and to Scrivener's Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.

† The existence of a blank space in any good manuscript is always regarded as evidence of an omission, to whatever cause the omission may be attributed. See, for instance, Tischendorf's note on Mark i. 10, "Δ spatium habet verbis aptum."

‡ A strikingly parallel case occurs in two MSS, F and G, of St. Paul's epistles. G leaves a vacant space at the end of Rom. xiv.; F has no trace of missing lines. It is certain that F and G were copies of one ancient manuscript, in which lines sufficient to fill up the vacant space must have existed. See Tischendorf in loc., and Scrivener's Introd., ed. 2, p. 158, note 2.

manuscripts were written about the same time, and if so possibly under the superintendence of Eusebius.* Now, Eusebius is the first critic who is known to have questioned the authenticity of the passage, on grounds to be considered presently. Is it improbable that his influence should have prevented the scribe of Codex B from inserting it, and that the scribe of Codex ℵ should go a step further, and omit all indication of its existence?†

One other uncial Codex, L, which, though written much later, about the eighth century, bears a strong resemblance to ℵ and B,‡ agrees with those manuscripts in ending the Gospel with verse 9; but after a spurious addition,§ it subjoins the whole passage, with the notice that it was extant, or generally received. It is also to be observed that in the few various readings which occur in this passage, L agrees with C, C*, and D, thus shewing that it followed a very ancient, probably the original, recension; see notes on *vv.* 10, 11, 17, 18. The evidence of this Codex adds nothing to the authority of the two already cited.

The evidence of the cursive manuscripts is really unanimous. None omit the passage. Some, however, mark it as one of which the genuineness was disputed. About thirty are cited by Tischendorf as subjoining a statement adverse to its authenticity: yet twenty-four of these very manuscripts quote the testimony of Victor of Antioch to its existence in the greatest number of accurate copies, especially in the Palestinian manuscript, which had belonged to Pamphilus, and probably represented the revision of Origen. The evidence adduced by Dean Burgon (ch. viii. pp. 114-123) on this point is new and conclusive. It completely disposes of the arguments drawn from a scholion wrongly attributed to Eusebius, which is attached to some cursive manuscripts. Considering the position of Eusebius, his character as an able and impartial critic, and the well-known fact that he was intrusted by Constantine with the preparation of fifty copies of Holy Scripture, it might have been expected that the disputed passage would have disappeared in a large number of manuscripts: that it is retained in all but two old MSS, probably not independent, is a proof either that he did not venture upon so strong a step as obliteration in public documents, or that his opinion was generally rejected by the churches of the East and West. Scrivener holds it to be a strong confirmation of this view that, as Dean Burgon has shown, the disputed verses, certainly in the fourth century and probably much earlier, were read in the public services of the Church. They are found in all ancient Evangelisteria. (See Burgon, p. 205; Scrivener, pp. 510, 511.)

2. **Evidence of ancient Versions.**—This evidence is especially important on account both of the high antiquity of the versions and of their wide diffusion; they represent the judgment of the teachers of the early Church in every part of Christendom. It is a very remarkable fact, considering the influence of Eusebius and Jerome, that without one exception the most ancient Versions‖ recognise the disputed passage. A very brief notice will bring out this result with sufficient clearness.

We have first to consider the versions accepted throughout the East. The testimony of the Syriac is fourfold. The Peshito, dating from the second century; the Philoxenian, in two revisions; and the Curetonian: the

---

* See Tischendorf, Prolegomena in Cod. Sin. p. xxxi.

† Tischendorf held that ℵ was the oldest, but Scrivener and most critics maintain the priority of B. The earliest date assigned to either is the decennium before the middle of the 4th century. Hilgenfeld, whose earlier notice was answered by Müller in his Preface to the Epistle of Barnabas, still holds that Cod. ℵ was written at a much later date, sc. in the sixth century. See 'Einleitung,' p. 790, f. The critical value of the Codex is seriously affected by the extreme carelessness of the transcriber: see Buttmann ap. Hilg. l. c. p. 792, note 3. It is remarkable for omissions, an observation which applies also, though in a less degree, to Cod. B, and to other MSS and Versions, which belong to the same school of recension.

‡ Tischendorf, who has published both MSS, says, "Hoc addendum est, Codicem L præ omnibus reliquis cum celeberrimo Codice Vaticano convenire. Quæ convenientia est tanta ut ubi alter sine altero præcipueque ubi Codex L sine Codice B laudetur, suspicari queas a collatoribus aliquid prætermissum esse."—'Monumenta sacra inedita,' 1846, p. 16.

§ This addition is also found with some variations in the margin of a MS of the Coptic version, written in the year A.D. 1174, and in Æthiopic MSS, also of late date. It was evidently intended to supply a blank caused by the omission of the last twelve verses in some MSS circulated in Egypt. See Prof. Lightfoot's account of Coptic MSS in Scrivener's Introd. He quotes the passage in p. 330: the Greek will be found in Tischendorf's N. T. There is no question as to its spuriousness.

‖ Two versions, the Armenian, and the Arabic of the Vatican Codex, omit the passage; but the former, in its present state, is of late date, and the latter is assigned, by conjecture, to the ninth century. See Tisch. Prolegg. ed. vii., pp. ccxxxviii. ix. Neither version has any claim to represent the tradition of early Christendom: but in disputed passages both agree, generally, with the Egyptian recension.

last, which undoubtedly belongs to a very ancient time (the latest assigned to it being far earlier than that of the Sinaitic or the Vatican manuscript), bears a peculiar and unexpected testimony. The whole of St. Mark's Gospel is lost in the only extant copy, with the exception of one fragment, and that contains the last four verses.

The Coptic versions have a special interest. They come from the same school of recension as the two manuscripts ℵ and B, and in the great majority of disputed passages they agree with one or the other, generally with both. All manuscripts and editions of the best known, the Memphitic version, current in lower Egypt, and the very ancient fragments of the Sahidic or Thebaic version used in upper Egypt, recognise this passage. The former gives it in its entirety: one fragment of the latter contains part of the last verse of the chapter. These two versions are entirely independent of each other. See Woide, 'De vers. Bibl. Ægypt.' p. 19, and Professor Lightfoot ap. Scrivener, *l. c.* p. 353.

The testimony of the Western Church is equally decisive. The Vulgate, in all manuscripts, contains the entire passage. This version was prepared by Jerome, who certainly would not have admitted this portion, to which he alleges precisely the same objection as Eusebius, had he not found it in undisturbed possession. Thus also the still earlier version called the old Italic, which is admitted to belong to primitive antiquity.* All manuscripts in which the latter portion of St. Mark's Gospel is extant concur in retaining it, with the single exception of the copy called the Codex Bobbiensis, or *k*, which was used by Columban and is highly esteemed; but the text resembles that of the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS so closely that it cannot be regarded as an independent witness.

The Gothic Version, made by Bishop Ulphilas, in the fourth century, and extant in a manuscript of the highest authority, has the passage from v. 8 to the beginning of v. 12.† The value of this translation in disputed points is acknowledged by all critics; it is contemporary with the two manuscripts ℵ B, and with the earliest writer who is known to have questioned the authenticity of the last verses of the Gospel.

3. **Evidence from early writers.**—In the Epistle, which bears the name of St. Barnabas, and was written before the end of the first, or early in the second, century, there is a passage at the end of § xv., in which Anger, 'Synopsis,' and the editors of the Epistle, Zahn, Hilgenfeld, and J. G. Müller, concur in recognising a distinct reference to Mark xvi. 19. Speaking of the eighth day, *i.e.* Sunday, the writer says, "it is that in which Jesus rose from the dead, and, after His manifestation, ascended into heaven."‡

An allusion to v. 18 has been suggested by a notice of Papias, see note *in loc.*; and it is probable that Papias may have related the story there quoted in explaining or illustrating the discourse of our Lord recorded by St. Mark. The notice proves at least that an opinion, which was justified by this and by no other distinct text, prevailed in the Church at the beginning of the second century.§

The 'Shepherd of Hermas,' written probably before the middle of the second century, has a passage (Sim. ix. § 25) which Anger ('Synopsis,' p. 261) quotes from the Old Latin version, and which in the lately recovered Greek original, has verbal coincidences with Mark xvi. 16, too close to be merely fortuitous, sc. πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις—οἱ κηρύξαντες εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον—πορευθέντες.

We owe to an early antagonist of the Gospels the first external attestation to the existence of this section, in the middle of the second century, as a recognised portion of the original Gospel. Celsus has this statement: "Who saw these things? A woman subject to attacks of phrensy (πάροιστρος) as you assert." He repeats this twice, calling her γύναιον, a wench. See Origen c. Celsum, lib. ii. 55 and 59. Now, Celsus must refer either to St. John's Gospel, combining the account, which he found there, with an incidental notice in St. Luke viii. 2, which does not occur in any other account of the resurrection, or to this passage. In the former case he would give a formal attestation to the universal reception of the fourth Gospel, not to speak of the third, as recognised documents, to which alone he professes to appeal (cf. Origen c. Celsum, ii. § 13, 27, 74, and Anger, 'Synop-

---

* Jerome adopts the rendering of the Codex Vercellensis, the best MS of the old Italic.

† In the manuscript of Ulphilas, there is a gap after the first three words of verse 12, extending to Luke i. 15. Tischendorf says, "deficit a v. 12," which scarcely gives a correct impression.

‡ On the statement which seems to imply that the Ascension took place on the same day as the Resurrection, see the note of Müller on Barn. Ep. l. c., Riggenbach, and Wieseler 'Jahr. für deutsche Theologie,' 1870, p. 666. The Ascension is regarded as the consummation of the Resurrection, without regard to the interval between them; cf. Holtzmann, and Zahn's note in the last edition of the Apostolical Fathers, by Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn, Fasc. i. p. 57.

§ Hilgenfeld holds that Papias probably related the story in explaining xvi. 18. See 'Zeitschrift f. w. Theologie,' 1875, p. 266. Renan also recognises the allusion to Joseph Barsabas; 'Les Évangiles,' p. 206, n. 1.

sis,' p. xi.), a conclusion which would be entirely satisfactory were it admissible: but it is evident that the argument of Celsus, "as you assert," would have little or no force if he referred to St. John, who has no assertion or indication of the kind, or even to St. Luke, who does not allude to it in connection with the resurrection; whereas it would be felt as bearing strongly on this passage, which gives concisely and clearly the facts to which he alludes. It is certain that Celsus had St. Mark's Gospel before him, for he refers to it in two other passages (see Anger, 'Synopsis,' index ii. p. xxvi., and p. 275); Anger proves, against Olshausen, that Celsus cannot here allude to verse 8, and adds, "ita antiquissimum hoc habemus sectionis Mc. xvi. 9, ss. Testimonium." Celsus puts this argument into the mouth of a Jew. Origen (*l. c.* § 60) says there is nothing in Scripture which justifies the word πάροιστρος. That is true as regards the actual condition of Mary Magdalene at the time of the resurrection; but the statement in this verse might naturally suggest the argument to a subtle and unscrupulous opponent. Origen throughout his answer on this point refers exclusively to St. John, doubtless as giving the fullest and best known account of the transaction. It is possible that he did not himself receive this concluding portion of our Gospel; the only MSS which omit it belong undoubtedly to his school; but it is evident that the passage would not have strengthened his argument, and he might feel that it could be safely passed over, as being, in the opinion of some critics at that time, of questionable authority. Celsus, however, was certainly justified in treating the passage as part and portion of the original Gospel.

Justin Martyr, who wrote about the middle of the second century, refers to the last two verses repeatedly (four times according to Anger's 'Synopsis'). In some passages the allusions may be open to question, since, as is usual with this writer, he gives the substance rather than the words of the Evangelist; but in others the reference is so clear that it seems strange any critic should hesitate to recognise it; even Tischendorf says, "paullo plus probabilitatis habet Justini testimonium," Apol. i. 45. Justin quotes, indeed, the ipsissima verba of St. Mark. After citing at length the first part of the 110th Psalm, to which, as is shewn in the note on verse 19, express reference was made by St. Mark, he adds, "the saying, 'He shall send forth the rod of Thy power from Jerusalem,' was a prophetic announcement of the mighty word, which when the Apostles went forth from Jerusalem they preached everywhere." ὃν ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐξελθόντες πανταχοῦ ἐκήρυξαν. St. Mark's words are ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ.*

It is noteworthy that, although Justin Martyr has rarely occasion to quote separately from this Gospel, he leaves no room for doubt as to his familiarity with it; see notes on Mark iii. 17, and vi. 3; and Anger's table of references, Synopsis p. xxxv.

We come next to the testimony of Irenæus, a younger contemporary of Justin Martyr. On comparing the references in these two writers, we generally find that whereas Justin, who in his extant works addresses heathens, or unconverted Jews, gives for the most part the substance of the Evangelists' statements, or quotes their words from memory, not mentioning them by name, Irenæus, on the contrary, who writes exclusively for Christians, gives citations in their integrity, and is careful to name the writers, as those whose authority was universally recognised by the Church, and in many cases would not be contested by the heretics whom he was confuting. Now it is remarkable that Irenæus, who like Justin has very rarely occasion to quote this gospel separately, cites the beginning and the end in a passage which it may be well to give at length, considering its bearings not only upon the authenticity of the disputed portion, but upon the structure of the whole Gospel. "Wherefore Mark the interpreter and follower of Peter, *made the beginning* of the evangelical writing† thus, 'the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God, as it is written in the prophets: behold I send My messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way. A voice of one crying in the desert, prepare the way of the Lord, make the path straight before our God,' manifestly saying that the voices of the holy prophets were the beginning of the Gospel;‡ and shewing that He, whom they confessed as God and Lord, is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; Who also promised Him that He would send His messenger before His face; who was John, 'in the spirit and power of Elijah' crying in the wilderness 'prepare the way of the Lord, make the paths straight before our God.'—But *in the end of his Gospel* Mark saith, 'And the Lord Jesus

---

* Critics of very opposite schools consider that this passage proves conclusively that Justin Martyr had the last verses of our Gospel before him. Thus Volkmar, 'Die Evangelien,' p. 610, Mangold (the editor of Bleek's 'Einleitung,' ed. 2), and Hilgenfeld.

† "Conscriptionis," i.e. συγγράμματος, the word used by Celsus and by Justin Martyr.

‡ See critical note on ch. i. 2.

after He had spoken to them was received into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God,' confirming what was said by the Prophet, 'The Lord said unto my Lord sit Thou on My right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.'" (Adv. Hær. iii. 10, p. 461, ed. Stieren.)

It is admitted by all critics that this testimony of Irenæus is absolutely conclusive as to the general reception of the passage when he wrote; but weighty as that fact is, it gives but an incomplete view of the argument.

Irenæus was trained from boyhood as a Christian; in early youth he was a hearer of Polycarp, whose teaching made a deep and permanent impression upon his spirit; throughout life he held high and honourable office in the Church; he was equally conversant with its doctrines and customs in the East and the West; and he wrote in controversy with men, who were well acquainted with the traditions of the Church, especially with the history and usage of the New Testament. It is certain that he would not have quoted a passage open to challenge, without any intimation that it needed defence; that it had ever been questioned within or without the Church. Neither in Asia Minor, nor in Gaul, nor in Italy, could this portion of the Gospel have been called in question in his time: nor is there any indication of a dispute arising about it at any period of the Antenicene Church.

### INTERNAL EVIDENCES.

These have been noted in the commentary, but a brief recapitulation may serve to shew their force and mutual bearings.

i. First in order and importance is the evidence supplied by the structure of the Gospel. St. Mark observes the precise limits, which are distinctly marked by St. Peter and St. Paul: see note on ch. i. 1. He begins with the baptism of John, and ends with an account of the Ascension. The special object of his Gospel is to shew that Jesus, the Son of God, is the Possessor and Manifester of divine power. This is now recognised by critics of all schools; see the second note on ch. i. 1. The culminating manifestation of that power was undoubtedly the Ascension. Then St. Mark, for the first time in his narrative, uses the expression ὁ Κύριος, the Lord, and applies St. Peter's own words "seated at the right hand of God;" see note on ch. xvi. 19. The special signs of that power are also described in terms peculiar to St. Mark. No other evangelist lays so much stress on the outward manifestations of divine power, especially on the expulsion of Satan and his emissaries. This is the first sign which in the final charge is promised to the disciples; see note on xvi. 17.

ii. Evidence supplied by the structure of the last chapter.—St. Mark's object is evidently to shew the progressive effects produced by the various appearances after the Resurrection.

(*a*.) The first was an appearance of Angels, and as such preparatory only: its effect was simple bewilderment; the pious women to whom it was made were unable for the time even to obey the clear command to tell the disciples what they had seen and heard.

(*b*.) The second was a personal appearance of our Lord Himself: but it was vouchsafed to an individual only; she reported what she saw, but her account was not believed: vv. 9, 10.

(*c*.) The third appearance was also personal; it was made to two of the disciples. They believed, and like Mary Magdalene carried the tidings to the Apostles; but, like her they found no credence.

(*d*.) The fourth appearance was, so to speak, formal and official, made to the eleven themselves; see note on v. 14.

This combination shews how strongly the evangelist felt that nothing short of a personal manifestation of the risen Saviour produced full conviction.

After the record of these appearances St. Mark proceeds, with a rapid and abrupt transition in accordance with his usual style, to the final charge given to the Apostles immediately before the Ascension. This charge is certainly distinct from that recorded in St. John's Gospel, which was given on the evening of Easter Sunday; and, as we hold, from that in St. Matthew's Gospel, which was delivered in Galilee. In this charge the characteristics, which are so frequently noted in St. Mark's Gospel, are singularly prominent (see notes on vv. 15–18); and in the last verse of the chapter the accomplishment of our Lord's work and promises is briefly, but forcibly recorded.

iii. For the evidence from style, see the notes on each verse in the last section, and the treatise of Dean Burgon on the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel, pp. 136–190.

In addition to the arguments there adduced, the following appears worthy of special consideration. It has not been noticed by any writer on the subject.

St. Mark has a certain number of passages in which it is evident that he writes in independence of the other Gospels, either presenting new facts, or presenting in a different form facts described by the other evangelists.

Now, among the objections urged by modern critics, special stress is laid on the number of words peculiar to the last twelve verses of this Gospel. The question arises whether a similar peculiarity is not found in those other passages. It might be expected, inasmuch as the writer's own style would

naturally be marked most distinctly in them. To secure impartiality in dealing with this question, it may be well to confine ourselves to those passages which are noted as peculiar to St. Mark in the tenth section of the Eusebian Canons.

In that section nineteen passages are thus registered; see Tischendorf, Prolegg. to the seventh edition of the N. T., p. lxxx. We will consider the first eight of these in detail.

1. The first passage, ch. i. 45, has these expressions (*a*) ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν, corresponding very strikingly with ch. xvi. 20, ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ. (*b*) διαφημίζειν; in St. Mark here only. (*c*) φανερῶς; in St. Mark here only, twice elsewhere, John vii. 10 and Acts x. 3. (*d*) πάντοθεν or πανταχόθεν, (neither word is used elsewhere by St. Mark) the latter (for which there is good authority) is not found elsewhere in the N. T. (*e*) ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις, the reading of Tischendorf with א B D L, stands alone in the Gospels.

2. Ch. iii. 20-21. (*a*) οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ, not found elsewhere, is a peculiar phrase, and evidently strange to the copyists; see the variants in Tischendorf. (*b*) ἐξέστη, this is the only passage where the word stands alone in the same sense.

3. Ch. iv. 26-29. This parable is recorded by St. Mark only: it is full of new expressions. (*a*) Tischendorf, following א B D[gr.] L Δ, reads ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ; if correct, certainly peculiar. (*b*) τὸν σπόρον, twice in this parable, not elsewhere in St. Mark. Luke has it twice. (*c*) βλαστᾷ, Tischendorf, a reading which stands alone; others have βλαστάνῃ, which occurs once in St. Matthew, not elsewhere in the Gospels. (*d*) μηκύνηται, ἁ. λ. in the N. T. (*e*) αὐτομάτη ἁ. λ. in N. T. (*f*) καρποφορεῖ, twice in this passage, not elsewhere in St. Mark, twice only in the other Gospels. (*g*) παραδοῖ ἁ. λ. in form and meaning. (*h*) ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, a peculiar expression not without difficulty: cf. Rev. xiv. 15, 18. (*i*) θερισμός, in St. Mark here only.

4. Ch. iv. 34. (*a*) κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς ἰδίοις, peculiar to this passage. (*b*) ἐπέλυεν, does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., but, as is common in the case of words peculiar to St. Mark, it agrees with a derivative form in the second Petrine epistle. Hermas, who has many reminiscences of St. Mark, uses this verb frequently.

5. Ch. vi. 16. (*a*) ἀπεκεφάλισα, here and again in this same narrative, v. 28. (*b*) The construction—a very forcible one—ὃν—οὗτος occurs ch. xiv. 44, but not elsewhere in this Gospel.

6. Ch. vi. 31. (*a*) The expression, δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν, might be urged as peculiar. (*b*) ἀναπαύσασθε occurs once only elsewhere in this Gospel. (*c*) εὐκαίρουν, not elsewhere in St. Mark, twice only in the N. T.

7. Ch. vii. 1-4. (*a*) ἀνίπτοις, in Mark here only, twice in Matt. (*b*) πυγμῇ ἁ. λ. in the N. T. This is probably the true reading, but πυκνά, which Tischendorf, ed. 8, adopts, is equally absent from St. Mark, and occurs once only in a doubtful passage of St. Luke, verse 33. (*c*) βαπτίζονται might be questioned, as not occurring in the same sense elsewhere. (*d*) παρέλαβον, in the sense of receiving a tradition, does not occur elsewhere in the Gospels, though common in St. Paul. (*e*) βαπτισμούς—the word is not used at all in the Gospels save in this passage. (*f*) ξεστῶν ἁ. λ. in N. T. (*g*) παράδοσις may be added as occurring in St. Mark's Gospel only in connection with this passage.

8. Ch. vii. 31-37. (*a*) ἦλθεν διὰ Σίδωνος, the reading of Tischendorf, following א B D L Δ, presents a difficulty (see note *in loc.*) which would certainly have been urged, had it occurred in the disputed passage. (*b*) μογιλάλον, ἁ. λ. (*c*) ἀπολαβόμενος does not occur at all in Mark, or Matthew, nor elsewhere in the same sense. (*d*) ἐστέναξε, the verb is not found elsewhere in the Gospels. (*e*) ἐφφαθά, of course, is ἁ. λ. (*f*) διανοίχθητι, in St. Mark here only, in St. Matthew not at all. (*g*) ἠνοίγησαν, so Tischendorf with א B D Δ; in St. Mark here only. (*h*) ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμός, peculiar to this passage. St. Mark has not the word δεσμός elsewhere; the expression is not found in the N. T. (*i*) ὀρθῶς, not found in Matt., nor in the N. T. except in St. Luke. (*j*) ὑπερεκπερισσῶς, ἁ. λ. (*k*) ἀλάλους, elsewhere only in ch. ix.

It is unnecessary to give more instances; about the same proportion of rare words and expressions will be found in the other sections of the tenth Canon. Applying the method adopted by some critics in the case of the disputed passage, to other passages which are peculiar to St. Mark, we find that in twenty verses, taken in the order presented by the Eusebian Canon, there are no less than thirty-nine expressions at least equally open to objection as those which are represented to be fatal to the authenticity of the last twelve verses.

Yet not one of these sections has been rejected, or attacked on this ground. The peculiarities, so far as they have been noticed, have been justly regarded as characteristic of St. Mark's style. In part they are, of course, to be accounted for by the nature of the subject, new thoughts and new facts naturally eliciting new expressions; but both observations apply with equal force to the disputed passage, more especially to those verses on which the greatest stress has been laid.

## OBJECTIONS.

The statements of Eusebius, and of those Fathers who adopted them, remain to be considered.

There is little doubt as to the fact that the objections originated with Eusebius.* In a treatise addressed to Marinus,† who applied to him for a solution of certain difficulties connected with the interpretation of Holy Scripture, Eusebius has to meet the objection that the statements in the ninth verse of the 16th chapter cannot easily be reconciled with the account of St. Matthew. His object, therefore, is purely apologetic. He says, "Two answers may be given: in the first place, one who denied the authenticity of this section might say that it is not found in all the manuscripts of St. Mark's Gospel." Feeling, however, that this statement is scarcely strong enough for his purpose, he adds, "those manuscripts which are most accurate terminate the Gospel with the words, 'for they were afraid;'" and then, twice varying the form of expression, he says, "in nearly all the copies of St. Mark's Gospel, the end comes with these words; but the following words, extant, rarely in some, but not in all, may be regarded as superfluous, and especially if they should contain a contradiction to the testimony of the other Evangelists: this one might say, declining controversy, and completely putting a stop to superfluous discussion." A statement so vague and inconsistent would certainly have been rejected without hesitation had it been alleged in reference to any other contested portion of the Gospels.

What we have a right to infer from it amounts simply to this. In some copies of the Gospel, to which Eusebius, a learned critic, attached great importance, this portion was omitted: but his statement that it was missing in nearly all is scarcely reconcileable with the facts that it is extant in all manuscripts but three, in all ancient Versions, and that it is quoted by Fathers of the highest authority nearly two centuries before the time of Eusebius. The grounds for such omission may probably have been those which are suggested by Eusebius himself. The very brief accounts of our Lord's appearances might be regarded as superfluous (περιττὰ ἂν εἴη), the substance being fully given in the other Evangelists; and some difficulty might certainly be felt in reconciling details.‡ Other grounds have been suggested; but, whatever weight may be attached to them, none seriously affect the authenticity of the section. It might naturally have been inferred that Eusebius did not find the last verses in the manuscript preserved in the library at Cæsarea, which had been in the possession of Pamphilus, and appears to have been revised by Origen. It happens, however, that we have, by a singular chance, a distinct testimony to the contrary. Victor of Antioch, (of whose Commentary on St. Mark, printed in Cramer's Catenæ, tom. i., a full account is given by Dean Burgon), after saying that in very many copies of the present Gospel the passage beginning "Now when Jesus," &c. was not found, certain persons having supposed it to be spurious, adds, "yet we, at all events, inasmuch as in very many we have discovered it to exist, have subjoined also out of accurate copies the account of our Lord's ascension, following the words 'for they were afraid' in conformity with the Palestinian exemplar of Mark, which exhibits the Gospel verity." The statement is the more important, since Victor, who wrote in the latter half of the 5th century, is a copyist of Eusebius, to whose authority he for the most part implicitly defers.

It may also be fairly argued that Eusebius himself considered the statement very questionable, since he enters upon an elaborate argument to prove that St. Mark's account, rightly understood, is not at variance with that of St. Matthew (see Burgon, p. 50). It is also obvious from his argument that the acceptance of this portion was general, the questioner, Marinus, having evidently no notion that such a solution of the difficulty as would be supplied by its omission could be proposed.

But it is further asserted that the statement of Eusebius was received by the ablest critics of the following century, special stress being laid on the testimony of Jerome. It has, however, been proved that Jerome simply reproduces the statement of Eusebius in a work which professes to be independent, but is little more than a translation of the treatise in question. This curious fact, first observed and demonstrated by Dean Burgon (pp. 51–56), entirely invalidates the argument, so far as it rests upon Jerome. It is further shewn that Jerome accepted the

---

* It is assumed that Eusebius followed Origen. I find no evidence for this; it seems to be a conjecture suggested by the fact that Eusebius generally adopted Origen's views in critical matters. On the indication supposed to be found in the answer to Celsus, see p. 303.

† 'Quæstiones ad Marinum,' published by Mai in the 'Nova Patrum Bibliotheca,' vol. iv. pp. 255–7. The whole passage referred to is given by Dean Burgon, l. c. p. 265.

‡ Hilgenfeld, in a work published 1875, holds that the early omission of the paragraph is explained by its apparent discrepancy from the preceding portion, and he says that it is on no account to be set aside summarily, as spurious. 'Einleitung,' p. 513.

passage in his most important and authoritative work as translator and reviser. It is found, without any variation of the least importance, in all manuscripts of the Vulgate, and in the course of his writings Jerome quotes the ninth and the fourteenth verses.*

On the alleged support of other Fathers, shewn either to be mere echoes of Eusebius, or to have expressed no opinion on the subject, see the 5th chapter of Dean Burgon's work, and his summary, p. 65 ff.

The argument drawn from the absence of the numerals indicating the sections of each Gospel, and the place of each section in the Canons of Eusebius, cannot here be fully discussed; but it is important to observe that the numerals referring to sections are attributed to Ammonius without authority, and that the omission of all notice of this portion in the Canons is no more than might be expected, considering the opinion of Eusebius.†

After a careful, and certainly a dispassionate, survey of the whole subject, we feel bound to express our entire concurrence in the opinion expressed by Dr. Scrivener, the first living scholar in questions of textual criticism, who "defends the authenticity of this long and important passage, and that without the slightest misgiving" ('Introd.' p. 507). Such, too, is the opinion of Bishop Wordsworth and McClellan. Bleek also maintains its authenticity; see Einl. p. 292, and compare the remarks of Hilgenfeld in note ‡, p. 306. To Dean Burgon belongs the credit of a thorough examination of every argument which has been brought against the passage, in the course of which examination a vast mass of new and valuable materials has been brought to light. But in recording this result of inquiry, we feel equally bound to express deep regret that on either side any expressions should have been used calculated to excite feelings of antagonism. The critics, who in the early Church raised or accepted the objections to the passage, were certainly not actuated by motives derogatory to Christianity, nor did they go beyond the fair limits of criticism in examining the evidence for or against the authenticity of any portion of the received text of Scripture. Among the moderns who concur in rejecting this portion are found men of the highest character, not only for learning and critical acumen, but for deep, hearty reverence for the word of God; nor would the present writer have felt the slightest hesitation in adopting their conclusion, which, at the outset of the inquiry, he had himself regarded as all but certain, had he not been convinced of the unsoundness of the grounds on which it rests. It is simply a question of evidence; as it seems to the writer, the evidence of the immense majority of manuscripts, of ancient Versions, of early Fathers, and of internal structure, on the one side; on the other, of a single critic of great eminence, influenced by considerations which, in other cases, would generally be regarded as alien to scientific inquiry. The rejection might, perhaps, remove some difficulties in the exegesis of Scripture; the acceptance confirms our confidence in the general accuracy of the text of Scripture, and leaves us in undisturbed possession of facts important‡ in their bearings upon the work of the Saviour and the destinies of His Church.

---

* Jerome states expressly in his epistle to Damasus that one principal object which he kept in view was a thorough revision of the text, and that specially with reference to the four Gospels; "Hæc præsens præfatiuncula pollicetur quatuor evangelia—codicum Græcorum emendata conlatione, sed et veterum." See Burgon, p. 28.

† For a full discussion of this point see Burgon, pp. 125 ff., and Appendix 9, p. 295 ff., where strong arguments are adduced to shew that the numerals, if not the sections commonly, but incorrectly, called Ammonian, must have been the invention of Eusebius himself. See also Scrivener, Introd. p. 54 ff., where the reader will find a clear and succinct account of the sections and canons.

‡ The importance of the whole passage is shewn by the weight, which a most able disputant, in a late number of the 'Contemporary Review,' attaches to the omission of all notice of our Lord's Personal appearances after the Resurrection in this Gospel, which in common with many critics, he holds to be the oldest extant.

# THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

# ST. LUKE.

---

## CHAPTER I.

1 *The preface of Luke to his whole gospel.* 5 *The conception of John the Baptist,* 26 *and of Christ.* 39 *The prophecy of Elisabeth, and of Mary, concerning Christ.* 57 *The nativity and circumcision of John.* 67 *The prophecy of Zacharias, both of Christ,* 76 *and of John.*

FORASMUCH as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us,

2 Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning

---

CHAP. I.—1–4. INTRODUCTION.

1. *Forasmuch as.*] The language of the Preface is more polished and classical than that of those portions of the Gospel, in which St. Luke incorporates, apparently with slight modifications, accounts which he derives from other sources written or oral. This contrast is especially marked between the Preface and the remainder of the first two chapters. A similar distinction between the style of original and of documentary matter is observable in the Acts of the Apostles. The grace, modesty, and completeness of this introduction are recognised by the ablest critics. Ewald regards it as a perfect model. The writer does not claim to be a primary authority, but a careful inquirer, well acquainted with the course of events.

*many.*] It is evident that the *many* writers here spoken of cannot be *confined* to the other Evangelists. It is also evident from verse 2 that they cannot include the Evangelists *who were also Apostles.* St. Luke, therefore, does not here refer to St. Matthew, though he may, as critics (Weiss and others) hold, have used either that Gospel or, more probably, some of the documents on which it was based. It is questioned whether he includes St. Mark's Gospel, which, according to all ancient, and nearly all modern, authorities, was either written under St. Peter's influence, or contains the Evangelist's record of that Apostle's teaching: but there can be little doubt that St. Luke knew that Gospel, and uses it largely in his narrative. There are points of strong resemblance to the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews, but there can be no reference to other apocryphal writings, which are of far later date, and in no way answer to St. Luke's description. What he asserts is that many writers had undertaken to construct an orderly narrative, founded on the teaching of the eye-witnesses of the Word. The expression, properly rendered, *taken in hand*, implies that this was a great and difficult, perhaps an unauthorized, task, but by no means that the attempts had been failures. That their success generally was but partial is a fair inference from St. Luke's statement, as also that there was occasion and need for a more complete history.

*most surely believed.*] Lit. "fulfilled," i. e. accomplished in accordance with the Divine will. See Note at the end of this Chapter.

2. *Even as.*] This clause refers to the statement that many had taken in hand to construct an orderly narrative. Some connect it with the words immediately preceding; but, as others (Meyer, Rösger, &c.) have shewn, the main point was, that as others had written such a narrative, so St. Luke having access to the same sources, and being in a position to inquire into all questions of importance, might properly supplement their work with special reference to the doctrinal instruction which had been already received by Theophilus and other converts.

*delivered.*] The original verb, and its correlative "received" (1 Cor. xi. 23; xv. 1) are of continual use in the New Testament, to express the handing on of the great truths of the Evangelical history. which are regarded as a sacred deposit (1 Tim. i. 18; vi. 20; 2 Tim.

were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word;

3 It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus,

4 That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.

5 ¶ THERE was in the days of Herod, the king of Judæa, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia: and his

---

i. 13, 14) to be transmitted from generation to generation.

*from the beginning.*] From the beginning of our Saviour's ministry. Compare Acts i. 21, 22; and note on Mark i. 1. The Apostles had been eye-witnesses of the events which were the matter of "the word" preached, and thus became "ministers of the word." "The word" is not used in the high signification which the term bears in the writings of St. John: it simply means the Gospel.

*having had perfect understanding.*] "**Having closely followed**," or "**having traced out**," the whole history.

*from the very first.*] This refers to an earlier starting-point than that specified in verse 2. The "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" began their teaching with the Baptism of John. The Gospel of St. Mark, and the main body of the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke, begin at this point. And it was a necessary qualification for the Apostleship (in filling up the place of Judas) to have been of the number of those who associated with the Saviour from the time of the Baptism of John (Acts i. 23). St. Luke, however, has traced back the history to an earlier period, even to the events immediately preceding the Birth of Christ.

*in order.*] In the order in which the events occurred. The original word does not necessarily imply chronological order. But in the present context, and in view of the frequent use by St. Luke of notes of time, we are probably so to understand it in this place. As St. Matthew groups together events and discourses on the principle of mutual likeness, St. Luke connects them mainly, though not invariably, according to their historical sequence.

*most excellent Theophilus.*] Compare Acts i. verse 1. The title *most excellent* (κράτιστος) occurs thrice in the Acts of the Apostles (xxiii. 26; xxiv. 3; xxvi. 25): in addresses to Roman Governors, and in Inscriptions it is formally applied to officials of high rank. 'Theophilus' means 'loved by God,' but it is admitted by nearly all critics to be a proper name, not a mere appellation. Michaelis would identify this person with a high-priest, son of Ananias, who was displaced by Agrippa (Joseph. A. xviii. 5, 3); but modern critics concur in holding that, like St. Luke himself, Theophilus was a Gentile convert. He was probably an Italian, perhaps a dweller in Rome, where St. Luke is supposed to have written this Gospel. In the Clementine Recognitions, which refer to this period, a person of distinction bearing this name is said to have then lived at Antioch; the work is full of legendary notices and has no authority; but Hilgenfeld ('Einl.' p. 555) connects this statement with the early tradition that Antioch was the birthplace of St. Luke. There is an old and probable tradition that Theophilus became a Bishop, according to the Apostolical Constitutions of Cæsarea Philippi. The point of real importance is that a man of high official rank was a convert at this early period, going through a course of oral instruction, and continuing earnest research into the facts on which that instruction was based.

4. *mightest know.*] Mightest know thoroughly, or **clearly**.

*hast been instructed.*] "**Wert instructed.**" The original term is properly used of oral instruction, by which the facts of the Evangelical History and doctrinal truths were at first communicated. See verse 2; and compare 1 Cor. xv. 1–11. St. Luke undertakes to supply a record of all facts and discourses on which such teaching was founded.

5–20. ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE BIRTH OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST.

5. *There was.*] The very first word of the narrative, in the original, has a savour of the Old Testament: and this is also characteristic of the remainder of this chapter and that which follows. It is most likely that St. Luke has here embodied in his history an earlier record, probably a translation from an Aramaic writing, and it has been suggested with much probability that these chapters, referring to affairs of a private and domestic character, are the work of some members of the Holy Family. Some have seen in the artless and simple style of the narrative the hand of a woman and have attributed it to the mother of Christ; others, perhaps with more probability, to James "the Lord's brother." (Oosterzee.)

*in the days.*] The mode of expression is

wife *was* of the daughters of Aaron, and her name *was* Elisabeth.

6 And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.

7 And they had no child, because that Elisabeth was barren, and they both were *now* well stricken in years.

8 And it came to pass, that while he executed the priest's office before God in the order of his course,

9 According to the custom of the priest's office, his lot was to burn in-

---

Aramaic or Hebraizing. St. Luke, in accordance with his professed intention of writing "in order," begins his history with a chronological reference. Compare Matt. ii. 1.

*a certain priest.*] The form of expression and the mention of the "course" to which Zacharias belonged shew that he was not the high-priest. But upon that supposition, and upon the further assumption that the angel appeared to him during his ministration on the great Day of Atonement (the tenth day of the month Tisri) the traditional date of the Baptist's birth, and, by consequence, that of the Nativity of Christ, was possibly based.

*the course of Abia.*] or "of Abijah." David divided the priests into twenty-four bodies, who were to serve in the Temple week by week (1 Chron. xxiv. 3–19; Josephus, 'Ant.' vii. 15, 7). Of these courses that of Abijah was the eighth in order. It has been attempted to fix the date of the Baptist's birth by the order in which the several courses were on duty. The Temple is said in the Talmud to have been burnt Aug. 4, A.D. 70, the day on which the first course commenced its office. See Derenbourg; 'Histoire de la Palestine,' p. 291, n. 3. If this statement, which is in part confirmed by Dio Cassius, lxvi. 7, be accurate, the announcement to Zacharias took place about the middle of May: but the data are too uncertain to found any trustworthy argument upon them (Browne's 'Ordo Sæclorum,' 33; Lewin's 'Fasti Sacri,' p. 109). It appears that the whole body of priests constituting a course were on duty for a week, but that the particular functions required at each ministration were assigned to the members of each course by lot. See verse 9.

*his wife was.*] The Baptist was of priestly race, on both sides, an origin much esteemed among the Jews. Josephus, speaking of himself, says, "my family was not without distinction, but descended from priests." Joseph. 'de Vita,' 1. "John was of the priestly race in order that he might with the greater authority proclaim a change of priesthood" (Ambrose).

*Elisabeth.*] So named after her ancestress Elisheba, Aaron's wife, the daughter of Amminadab. Exod. vi. 23. The word means "God is my oath," *i.e.*, I worship God.

6. *righteous before God.*] That is to say, truly righteous, righteous in God's eyes and in His judgment, and not merely in appearance, or according to the judgment of men. Compare Gen. vii. 1. "Thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." The nature of their righteousness is limited and explained by what immediately follows. They strove honestly to keep God's commandments; their righteousness was a legal righteousness (compare ch. xviii. 18-23, and Matt. xix. 16–22), and as such it was necessarily imperfect; and therefore there is no real opposition between this place and the teaching of St. Paul, who tells us that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. iii. 23).

*commandments and ordinances.*] Probably the former term denotes the moral, and the latter the ceremonial, precepts of the Law (Calvin, Bengel, Godet). Meyer, however, considers the distinction arbitrary.

7. *no child.*] The births of Isaac, Samson, Samuel, and John were all "against hope" (Rom. iv. 18), faint foreshadowings of a far greater miracle.

*well stricken in years.*] Literally "**advanced in their days.**" An Hebraism. "A pleasant description of the advanced age of godly people, now looking forward to a blessed goal" (Bengel).

8. *executed.*] "**Was executing.**" It was his week of duty. See on verse 5.

9. *According to the custom.*] This is to be referred to what immediately follows. Zacharias drew lots, according to the custom of the priesthood, and the lot, which fell to him, indicated the duty of offering incense.

*to burn incense, &c.*] Or "**To go into the Temple of the Lord and burn incense.**" The word "temple" in our version represents two different terms in the original. One stands for the entire building or group of buildings with all its courts and enclosures. The other, used in this place, represents the sanctuary, a translation, so to speak, into stone of the Tabernacle constructed in the wilderness, into which only the priests were allowed to enter. The altar of incense, referred to in verse 11, stood in front of the vail which

cense when he went into the temple of the Lord.

[a] Ex. 30. 7. Lev. 16. 17.

10 [a] And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense.

11 And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense.

12 And when Zacharias saw *him*, he was troubled, and fear fell upon him.

13 But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John.

14 And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth.

15 For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb.

16 [b] And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God.

[b] Mal. 4. 6.

17 And he shall go before him in

---

divided the two portions of the Sanctuary (Exod. xxx. 1–6; xl. 5, 26). Incense was to be offered upon this altar evening and morning, at the time when the lamps were lighted and trimmed (Exod. xxx. 7, 8).

10. *praying without.*] *Without* the sanctuary, but *within* the Temple, in the wider sense of that word. Incense symbolised prayer: Psalm cxli. 1, 2; Rev. viii. 3.

11. *there appeared.*] No mere ecstatic vision, but the real appearance of a spiritual being. The narrative leaves no room for doubt that this is intended (so Meyer, De Wette, Olshausen). "According to Scripture, we are surrounded by angels (2 Kings vi. 17; Ps. xxxiv. 7), whom God employs to defend us; but in our ordinary condition we have not the perception necessary to make us aware of their presence. For this we need a peculiar state of receptivity. That was the state of Zacharias at this time. He had been prepared for it by the sanctity of the place, by the solemnity of the service which he was about to fulfil, by his lively sympathy with those who prayed for national deliverance, and finally by the sense of his own domestic trial." Godet.

*the right side.*] An omen of good fortune, according to De Wette, Meyer, Oosterzee; this is shewn by Schoettgen to be in accordance with Jewish ideas, both in the Old Testament and in later times, see Hor. Heb. in Matt. xxv. 33. It also marks the high dignity of the angel (compare Acts vii. 56), who says of himself (verse 19) "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God."

12. *he was troubled.*] Compare Dan. x. 7–12; Rev. i. 17, 18, and see note on Mark xvi. 5.

13. *thy prayer.*] It has been inferred from this that Zacharias had in times past prayed for a son; but at such a time the prayer of Zacharias, as priest offering the supplications of the people, must have referred to their deliverance by the coming of the Messiah, of whom the Baptist was the immediate precursor. So Augustin, Theophylact, Calovius, Ewald, and Meyer.

*John.*] The Hebrew form of the name is "Jehochanan," *i.e.* "the Lord is gracious."

14. *And thou shalt, &c.*] Closely connected with the name which was to be given to the Baptist.

15. *great in the sight of the Lord.*] Not with mere worldly greatness. Compare and see on verse 6.

*neither wine.*] Compare the history of Samson (Judg. xiii. 3–5), and the law of the Nazarites (Numb. vi. 2–4). The strict and severe life of John is described by the Evangelists (Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6), and contrasted by our Lord Himself with His own manner of life (Matt. xi. 18, 19).

*strong drink.*] In the original "sikera," an Aramaic word, meaning any kind of fermented liquor made from other materials than the juice of the grape. The same word is used in the LXX version of Judg. xiii. 4. Wycliffe renders "He shall drink ne wine ne syder," the Anglo-Saxon has "beor."

*filled with the Holy Ghost.*] The contrast between the influence of the Holy Spirit, and the effect of artificial stimulants, appears also in Acts ii. 15–18; Eph. v. 18.

*from his mother's womb.*] See below, verse 41.

17. *he shall go before him.*] Before "the Lord their God" spoken of in the previous verse. "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me"

the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient [1]to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.

[1] Or, *by*.

18 And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years.

19 And the angel answering said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and am sent to speak unto thee, and to shew thee these glad tidings.

20 And, behold, thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak, until the day that these things shall be performed, because thou believest not my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season.

21 And the people waited for Zacharias, and marvelled that he tarried so long in the temple.

22 And when he came out, he could not speak unto them: and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the temple: for he beckoned unto them, and remained speechless.

23 And it came to pass, that, as soon as the days of his ministration were accomplished, he departed to his own house.

---

(Mal. iii. 1). "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse" (Mal. iv. 5, 6). The angelic communication plainly refers to these two passages, on the latter of which, and on his mysterious removal from this world, a popular expectation of the return of Elijah was founded (John i. 21; Mark vi. 15; Matt. xvi. 14; xvii. 10; xxvii. 47, 49). Our Lord declares that the expectation had been fulfilled by the appearance of the Baptist; and the words of the angel shew us in what sense his coming was a return of Elijah. He came in the "spirit and power of Elias," as a great religious and moral reformer, a stern rebuker of vice (compare Mark vi. 17–20 with 1 Kings xviii. 18; xxi. 19, 20), and a contemner of the habits and fashions of his age (compare Matt. iii. 4 with 2 Kings i. 8).

*to the wisdom.*] Or "**unto the wisdom**:" the word is specially applied to the practical and moral direction of the understanding, in which the "disobedient," who are here opposed to "the just," are utterly wanting. The question arises whether we are to regard this clause as a free rendering of the second member of Malachi's antithesis. So Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, and Olshausen understand it, regarding the "disobedient" as equivalent to the "children" of Malachi. The interpretation, however, appears forced and unnecessary; since the words which immediately follow are also unconnected with the text in Malachi.

**18.** *Whereby.*] Zacharias asks for a sign, a symptom of unbelief (compare Matt. xii. 38, 39); and a sign is given him, by way of punishment (verse 20).

*an old man.*] The ministrations of the Levites were to cease at the age of fifty years (Numb. viii. 25, 26), but this law did not apply to the priests, who retained office to an advanced age.

**19.** *Gabriel.*] *I.e.* "Man of God." The angel who appeared to Daniel (Dan. viii. 16; ix. 21) and to the Blessed Virgin (verse 26). The name "denotes the substance of the angel's message, concerning the incarnation of the Son of God" (Bengel). The names of two angels only are given in Holy Writ; Michael, the executor of God's decrees; Gabriel, the announcer of His purposes.

*that stand in the presence of God.*] The angel stands, as a servant or minister (1 Kings x. 8; 2 Kings v. 25) near the throne of God (compare Rev. viii. 2), as an officer of high rank in the court of the heavenly king. He says this, to accredit himself as a Divine messenger, and to assure Zacharias of the performance of his promise.

**20.** *dumb.*] Rather "**silent,**" because "unable to speak." The dumbness of Zacharias was to be at once a sign, and a penalty for having sought one.

**21.** *marvelled.*] It is said that the priests ordinarily continued only for a short time in the sanctuary, apparently from a sense of reverence. According to the Talmud they feared the displeasure of God, should they not discharge their duties with all possible earnestness and speed.

**22.** *a vision.*] Partly from the unusual delay, and partly from his silence: perhaps also from his excited manner and appearance.

*beckoned.*] Or "**kept beckoning.**"

24 And after those days his wife Elisabeth conceived, and hid herself five months, saying,

25 Thus hath the Lord dealt with me in the days wherein he looked on *me*, to take away my reproach among men.

26 And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth,

27 To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name *was* Mary.

28 And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, *thou that art* [1] highly favoured, the Lord *is* with thee: blessed *art* thou among women.

29 And when she saw *him*, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be.

30 And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God.

[1] Or, *graciously accepted*, or, *much graced*: see ver. 30.

---

**24.** *hid herself.*] She remained confined to her house during the first five months of her pregnancy (see verses 26, 36). The reason of this concealment is doubtful. Certain ancient interpreters ascribe it to diffidence, on account of her advanced age (thus Origen and Ambrose); others to a desire for religious retirement, which appears more probable, see verse 25, and compare the conduct of Mary as related verse 39. It may be questioned whether the Evangelist meant to intimate that the retirement of Elisabeth was limited to the five months, and whether this statement is not rather to be taken closely with verse 26. "She concealed herself for *five* months, saying, &c. . . . . But in the sixth month, the angel Gabriel was sent," &c.

**25.** *my reproach.*] That of being childless. Compare Gen. xxx. 23 (where Rachel uses the same words): Isaiah iv. 1; Hos. ix. 11.

26-39. Announcement of our Lord's Birth.

*Gabriel.*] See on verse 19.

*Nazareth.*] We learn from St. Luke alone that the mother of our Lord had lived at Nazareth before His birth. St. Matthew does not allude to this (Matt. ii. 23), and here, without any actual contradiction between the two narratives, we have a distinct proof of their total independence. "It is one peculiarity of the Galilean hills, as distinct from those of Ephraim or Judah, that they contain or sustain green basins of table-lands just below their topmost ridges . . . . Such above all is Nazareth. Fifteen gently rounded hills 'seem as if they had met to form an enclosure' for this peaceful basin; they rise round it like the edge of a shell to guard it from intrusion. It is 'a rich and beautiful field' in the midst of these green hills—abounding in gay flowers, in fig-trees, small gardens, hedges of the prickly pear; and the rich grass affords an abundant pasture. . . . These are the natural features which for nearly thirty years met the almost daily view of Him who 'increased in wisdom and stature' within this beautiful seclusion" (Stanley). The obscurity of Nazareth was such that it is not even named in the Old Testament, nor in the Talmud, where a large number of places otherwise unknown are mentioned, nor is it noticed by Josephus, who speaks of 204 cities and towns in Galilee. This is important in its bearing upon the originality of our Lord's teaching. In Nazareth the only instruction He could receive would be in His own family and in the synagogue; there He would not be under the influence of Grecian culture, nor under that of Rabbinical teachers, with whose whole spirit and system His own was most strongly contrasted. See F. Delitzsch, 'Jesus und Hillel,' p. 14.

**27.** *of the house of David.*] These words refer grammatically to Joseph, since the writer repeats the mention of the "Virgin" in the last clause of this verse. Otherwise he would have said "her name," or "whose name was Mary." Of the descent of the Virgin nothing is said in this place; but it is clear from verses 32, 69, that the Evangelist regards Mary also as a descendant of David.

*Mary.*] Mariam, *i.e.* Miriam (Exod. xv. 2).

**28.** *highly favoured.*] So, no doubt, the original term should be rendered; it implies a receiver, not a bestower, of grace, as might perhaps be inferred from the rendering of the Vulgate, "full of grace." The original word occurs also Eph. i. 6, where it is rendered "accepted," and nowhere else in the New Testament. Compare verse 30. The favour in both passages refers to spiritual blessing.

*the Lord is with thee.*] Or "the Lord be with thee" (as in Ruth ii. 4), but more probably as in our version. Compare Judg. vi. 12.

*blessed art thou among women.*] A Hebrew

c Isai. 7. 14. Matt. 1. 21.

31 c And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.

32 He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:

d Dan. 7. 14. Mic. 4. 7.

33 d And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

34 Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?

35 And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

36 And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren.

37 For with God nothing shall be impossible.

38 And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her.

39 And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Juda;

---

superlative. The clause is omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles with the Vatican manuscript. It is found in all other manuscripts and versions, and is quoted frequently by early Fathers.

31. *shalt call.*] Compare verse 13; and Matt. i. 21, where see note.

32. *the Son of the Highest.*] Oosterzee observes that "this name seems here used by the angel in a theocratic sense," *i. e.* to signify the expected Messiah: but the angelic prediction speaks clearly of a divine origin, and we must read it in the light of subsequent revelations.

*his father David.*] This must refer to Mary's descent; she is expressly told, verse 35, that her Child would have no mortal father. See too her own declaration, verse 34.

33. *there shall be no end.*] This recalls Isaiah ix. 7; Dan. vii. 14; and shews (especially if we compare it with the passage last referred to) that the kingdom of the Son of Mary was to be universal and supernatural. The delivery of the Kingdom to the Father, spoken of by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 24–28), refers to the cessation of the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, at the close of the existing dispensation.

34. *How.*] The mental attitude of Mary appears at first sight to resemble that of Zacharias (verse 18). Yet Zacharias was struck dumb because he believed not (verse 20), and of Mary it was said, "Blessed is she that believed" (see also verse 38). Zacharias, however, had asked for a sign in confirmation of the angel's promise; whereas the question of Mary expresses, not unbelief, or even doubt, but innocent surprise.

35. *The Holy Ghost.*] Compare Matt. i. 18-20; see also (for the form of expression) Acts i. 8.

*shall be born.*] Or "**is to be born**;" literally "is being born."

*the Son of God.*] Not here (as verse 32) in the Messianic sense; nor essentially by the Eternal Generation; but because the Human Nature of Christ was the direct and miraculous production of Divine power.

36. *thy cousin Elisabeth.*] Or "**kinswoman.**" The exact nature of the relationship cannot be known. That Elisabeth, the cousin of Mary, was "of the daughters of Aaron" (verse 5) does not disprove the latter to have been of the tribe of Judah. The restriction in Numb. xxxvi. 6-9, referred to heiresses, whose property it was important to preserve to the tribe (Oosterzee). And if there is any difficulty in supposing a connection between Mary of the tribe of Judah and Elisabeth of the tribe of Levi, there is an equal difficulty in accounting for a marriage between Mary of the tribe of Levi and Joseph of the tribe of Judah. See also the instance of Jehoshabeath, "daughter of king Jehoram, and wife of Jehoiada the priest," 2 Chron. xxii. 11. This passage, then, proves nothing against the lineal descent of our Lord from David.

*old age.*] See on verse 18.

37. *for with God.*] Compare Gen. xviii. 14.

38. *Behold, &c.*] A great example of faith. She not only believes the assurance of the angel, but prays for its fulfilment.

39-56. THE VIRGIN AND ELISABETH.

39. *And Mary arose.*] We have here to

40 And entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth.

41 And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost:

42 And she spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed *art* thou among women, and blessed *is* the fruit of thy womb.

43 And whence *is* this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?

44 For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy.

45 And blessed *is* she [1]that believed: for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord.

[1] Or, *which believed that there.*

46 And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord,

---

consider (1) the direction, and (2) the object of Mary's journey. The Evangelist speaks in general terms of "the hill-country," and then, more particularly, of "a city of Juda" (*i.e.* a city belonging to that tribe), or, as some take it, "the city of Juda," *i.e.* the city bearing that name. It is sought to identify "Juda" with Juttah, which is recorded to have been given to the descendants of Aaron (Josh. xxi. 16). It is, however, more natural to take "Juda" of the tribe within whose confines the unnamed city was situated (compare Matt. ii. 6). The city was probably one of those towns, which, together with Hebron, were conferred upon the priests (Josh. xxi. 13-16). We can hardly suppose Hebron itself to be meant, as a place so well known would most likely have been named. All we know is that the town to which Mary travelled, and in which, apparently, the parents of the Baptist ordinarily dwelt, was situated in the hilly district south of Jerusalem, and west of the Dead Sea, of which Hebron was the centre. The object of the journey seems to have been two-fold, first, retirement from the world (like Elisabeth, verse 24), and then in order to confer with Elisabeth (of whose situation she had just been informed by the angel, verse 36), on the blessings promised to her. Her eagerness to do this, appeared in the "haste" with which the journey was undertaken.

**41.** *the babe leaped.*] See verse 15. It is inconsistent with the tenor of the narrative to suppose that Mary had informed Elisabeth of the angel's promise. Elisabeth knew it by express revelation.

**42.** *Blessed art thou.*] Compare and see on verse 28.

**43.** *whence is this.*] An expression of humility and reverence. What she had experienced assured her that the mother of her Lord stood before her. In whatever sense Elisabeth named the unborn Messiah her Lord, there is no doubt how we are to understand her words.

**46.** *My soul doth magnify.*] We can scarcely regard it as accidental that St. Luke, who was certainly a man of culture, alone of the sacred historians preserves the three Evangelical hymns, which the Church has wrought into her services, the *Magnificat*, the *Benedictus*, the *Nunc Dimittis*, and the angelic hymn which has since been developed into the *Gloria in Excelsis*. It makes nothing against the historical character of the narrative that it is interspersed with lyrical passages. Those who speak under strong feeling naturally break out into language of a more exalted style than that of ordinary prose; and poetry is the rhetoric of the East. Even among Western writers, in early times, there are examples of sudden transitions from prose to verse, where strong feeling has to be expressed. Moreover we are distinctly told that Zacharias and Simeon spoke under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit. Elisabeth, too, whose address to the Blessed Virgin (verse 42-45) has a poetical tone "was filled with the Holy Ghost;" nor can we suppose the same divine influence to have been absent from the Virgin herself (see verse 35). What wonder that He "who spake by the Prophets" should cause those who spoke by this power to use the language of Psalmists and Prophets? This song of the Virgin is, moreover, to a great extent a reminiscence of the song of Hannah, uttered under similar circumstances (1 Sam. ii. 1-10), with the words of which we must suppose Mary to have been familiarly acquainted. Meyer points out that the hymn falls into four strophes or stanzas, viz., verse 46-48 ("My soul" . . . . "handmaiden"), 48-50 ("for, behold" . . . . "generation"), 51-53, and 54, 55.

*My soul.*] Contrasted with "spirit" in the next verse. Compare 1 Thess. v. 23. All the higher and lower powers and faculties of

47 And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.

48 For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.

49 For he that is mighty hath done to me great things; and holy *is* his name.

50 And his mercy *is* on them that fear him from generation to generation.

51 [a] He hath shewed strength with his arm; [b] he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.

52 [c] He hath put down the mighty from *their* seats, and exalted them of low degree.

53 [d] He hath filled the hungry with good things; and the rich he hath sent empty away.

54 He hath holpen his servant Israel, [e] in remembrance of *his* mercy;

55 [f] As he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever.

56 And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house.

57 Now Elisabeth's full time came that she should be delivered; and she brought forth a son.

58 And her neighbours and her cousins heard how the Lord had shewed great mercy upon her; and they rejoiced with her.

59 And it came to pass, that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they called him Zacharias, after the name of his father.

60 And his mother answered and said, Not *so;* but he shall be called John.

61 And they said unto her, There

[a] Isai. 51. 9.
[b] Ps. 33. 10.
[c] 1 Sam. 2. 6.
[d] Ps. 34. 10.
[e] Jer. 31. 3, 20.
[f] Gen. 17. 19. Ps. 132. 11.

---

her soul were stirred by the sense of God's goodness to her.

47. *hath rejoiced.*] "**Rejoiced.**" Mary speaks of a definite outburst of joy, as she speaks (verses 48, 49) of a definite manifestation of God's mercy and love towards herself. Compare 1 Sam. ii. 1.

48. *hath regarded.*] "**Looked upon,**" *i.e.* with favour. Compare 1 Sam. i. 11.

*low estate.*] Literally "**Humiliation;**" referring apparently to the contrast between her present condition and that of the house of David from which she sprang." See on ch. ii. 24.

49. *hath done to me great things.*] "**Did for me great things,**" or, according to the more usually received reading, "**great marvels.**" Compare Ps. lxxi. 19.

50. *And his mercy, &c.*] "**And His mercy is unto generations of generations**" (or, as we are perhaps to read, "**unto generations and generations**") "**for them that fear Him.**"

51. *He hath shewed, &c.*] or "**He sheweth strength with his arm; He scattereth the high-minded in the intent of their heart; He putteth down rulers from thrones, and lifteth up the humble. Hungry men filleth He with good things, and rich men sendeth He away empty. He helpeth Israel His servant, that He may remember mercy (according as He spake unto our fathers) towards Abraham and his seed for ever.**" Compare 1 Sam. ii. 4-8.

56. *about three months.*] That is to say until the time of Elisabeth's delivery (compare verses 36, 57), or very near it. It would appear that the circumstances narrated in Matt. i. 18-24 occurred after the return of Mary from her visit to Elisabeth. Her situation would now become known; and the conduct of Joseph, as related by St. Matthew, is natural. It must be added that St. Luke tells us that Mary "returned to her own house,"—evidently that from which she "arose . . . and went . . . with haste" immediately after the annunciation" (verse 39). He has not yet told us that Joseph had taken unto him his wife (Matt. i. 24).

59-80. BIRTH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

59. *on the eighth day.*] Gen. xvii. 12. It was customary to give names to male children at their circumcision, and to females when they were weaned.

*called.*] "**were calling,**" or "**were for calling.**"

60. *John.*] Compare verse 13. It is quite unnecessary to suppose a special revelation to Elisabeth. Zacharias, who afterwards wrote the name on a tablet, cannot have failed to communicate the prediction of the angel in writing to his wife.

is none of thy kindred that is called by this name.

62 And they made signs to his father, how he would have him called.

63 And he asked for a writing table, and wrote, saying, His name is John. And they marvelled all.

64 And his mouth was opened immediately, and his tongue *loosed*, and he spake, and praised God.

65 And fear came on all that dwelt round about them: and all these [1]sayings were noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judæa.

[1] Or, *things.*

66 And all they that heard *them* laid *them* up in their hearts, saying, What manner of child shall this be! And the hand of the Lord was with him.

67 And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying,

68 Blessed *be* the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people,

69 [g] And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David;

[g] Ps. 132. 17.

70 [h] As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began:

[h] Jer. 23. 5. & 30. 9.

71 That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us;

72 To perform the mercy *promised* to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant;

73 [i] The oath which he sware to our father Abraham,

[i] Gen. 22. 16.

74 That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear,

75 In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.

76 And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou

---

**62.** *made signs.*] The object of the friends was probably to call the attention of the father, without using words which might offend Elisabeth (Meyer); or, as Reuss says, they assume that he was aware of the circumstances, and simply bespeak his attention.

**64.** *his mouth.*] The angel had declared (verse 20) that the penalty of dumbness should continue until the fulfilment of his words. Zacharias makes the first use of the recovered faculty of speech to give God glory.

**65.** *And fear, &c.*] This interruption is anticipatory. The song in verses 68-79 naturally follows verse 64.

*hill country.*] Compare and see on verse 39.

**67.** *And . . . Zacharias, &c.*] Repeated from verse 64. See on verse 46.

**68.** *for he hath visited, &c.*] "Visited" is used in the sense looked on with favour. See note on ch. xix. 44. "**Because He looked with favour on, and made redemption for His people, and raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of David his servant.**" The "horn" is a common symbol of power (compare Ps. cxxxii. 17.) In this case the horn of salvation is the Messiah. And the past tense is used, because the horn of salvation was virtually raised up, when the Incarnation became an accomplished fact (Godet).

**71.** *That we should be saved from.*] "**Salvation from.**" In apposition with the "horn of salvation" in verse 69.

**72.** *To perform, &c.*] Literally "**To do mercy with**" (*i.e.* to shew mercy to) "**our fathers.**" This is explained by the remainder of the verse. God would shew mercy towards the patriarchs, in keeping His covenant with them and shewing mercy to their descendants.

**74.** *without fear.*] The position of this phrase in the original makes it emphatic. The spiritual nature of the deliverance to be wrought by the Messiah is clearly marked in this sentence. Compare verses 77-79.

**76.** *And thou.*] Perhaps we ought to read (with ℵ B C D, Tischendorf and Tregelles) "**and thou too,**" contrasting his own child (to whom Zacharias now turns) with the Messiah, the "horn of salvation," of whom he has just been speaking. In any case the meaning is the same.

*shalt be called.*] Compare verse 32.

*before the face of the Lord.*] Before the face of God (Mal. iii. 1; compare and see on verse 17). But literally and strictly before

shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways;

77 To give knowledge of salvation unto his people [1]by the remission of their sins,

78 Through the [1]tender mercy of our God; whereby the [1]dayspring from on high hath visited us,

79 To give light to them that sit in darkness and *in* the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

80 And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his shewing unto Israel.

[1] Or, *for*.
[1] Or, *bowels of the mercy*.
[1] Or, *sun-rising*, or, *branch*, Num. 24. 17. Isai. 11. 1. Zech. 3. 8. Mal. 4. 2.

---

the face of Christ. It is impossible to resist the theological inference.

*prepare his ways.*] Compare Isaiah xl. 3; Matt. iii. 3.

**77.** *To give.*] *I.e.* In order to give.

*by the remission.*] "In the remission." The knowledge of salvation is given *in* the remission of sins: in this does experience of salvation consist.

**78.** *Through the tender, &c.*] "**By reason of the** tender mercy of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high **did visit us, to shine upon** them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death, **in order to direct** our feet into the way of peace." The words "by reason of" depend, not (as Meyer) on "the remission of their sins" alone, but upon the whole sentence in verse 77. The gift of the knowledge of salvation, which is imparted in the forgiveness of sins, is wholly due to God's tender mercy. God's free grace is the ultimate source of our salvation. And by (literally "in") this mercy, says Zacharias, the "day-spring from on high," the dawn of a new day for Israel and for mankind, sent to us from heaven, "visited us (for the use of the past tense, see on verse 68) in order that it might shine," &c. The last words of the hymn ("to guide," &c.) point to the ulterior object of the coming of this celestial dawn; and they shew at the same time that the images in the foregoing clauses are to be understood of spiritual light and spiritual darkness.

**80.** *And the child grew.*] Compare ch. ii. 40, 52. The narrative here takes leave of the Baptist for the present, but looks forward to ch. iii. 1.

*in spirit.*] *I.e.* in *his* spirit. But the human spirit is always regarded as enlightened by the Divine Spirit, of which it is, so to speak, the correlative organ.

*in the deserts.*] Not in absolutely waste and desert places, but in the thinly inhabited parts of Judæa. "The idea is that of a wide open space, with or without actual pasture" (Stanley, 'Sinai and Palestine,' App. § 9). Here (according to the angel's prediction, verse 15) he lived the life of a Nazarite, preparing himself, like Saul in the Arabian wilderness (Gal. i. 17), and One greater than Saul in the wilderness of Judæa (ch. iv. 1), for his great work,—"his shewing unto Israel," as the commencement of his ministry is here called, in obvious opposition to his previous retirement. The particular wilderness here referred to is probably that called the wilderness of Judæa (Matt. iii. 1, where see note), especially the rugged country on the western shores of the Dead Sea. This was in the neighbourhood of Hebron, and of the other sacerdotal cities in the district, to one of which (see on verse 39) John belonged. The question has been raised whether John here came in contact with the Essenes, who seem to have established ascetic communities in this region. The idea is opposed to the drift of the text, and the teaching of the Essenes was wholly opposed to that of the Baptist.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on verse 1.

**1.** *most surely believed.*] Greek πεπληροφορημένων; the verb πληροφορέω occurs frequently in biblical and patristic Greek. In the New Testament it is used by St. Paul twice in the Second Epistle to Timothy, iv. 5 and 17, unquestionably in the sense "fulfil," "accomplish." In Rom. iv. 21 the passive aorist occurs in the sense, "fully persuaded," so also in Rom. xiv. 5. In Col. iv. 12 the reading and sense are less certain. Here the Vulgate renders the word completæ; and this meaning is adopted by Cremer and Grimm, as also by Luther, Ebrard, De Wette, and Bleek. Other critics take it in a sense not differing substantially from our authorised version, viz. "fully accredited," or "established," *i.e.* confirmed by sure evidence. Thus the Syriac Version, Theophylact, Euthymius Zig., Olshausen, Meyer, Hoffmann, and Rösger, in the 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1876, p. 268. Ewald accepts the meaning "fully believed," for which, however, no parallel is found in the New Testament.

On the one hand, it is clear that "fulfilled," "accomplished," is the primary and radical meaning; on the other, that such accomplishment has special reference to the will of God, and to the effect produced upon the minds of Christians. No single English word exactly expresses this shade of meaning. The Greek may be paraphrased thus, "accepted as acts accomplished in accordance with God's will and promise." Bleek has a dissertation on the word in his commentary on Heb. ii. 2. Rösger, l.c., observes that the word as here used implies that the treatises to which St. Luke alludes contained true, if incomplete, accounts of our Lord's words and acts.

## CHAPTER II.

*1 Augustus taxeth all the Roman empire. 6 The nativity of Christ. 8 One angel relateth it to the shepherds: 13 many sing praises to God for it. 21 Christ is circumcised. 22 Mary purified. 28 Simeon and Anna prophesy of Christ: 40 who increaseth in wisdom, 46 questioneth in the temple with the doctors, 51 and is obedient to his parents.*

AND it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be [1] taxed.

[1] Or, *enrolled.*

2 (*And* this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.)

3 And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city.

4 And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judæa, unto [a] the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; (because he was of the house and lineage of David:)

[a] John 7. 42.

5 To be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child.

6 And so it was, that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered.

7 And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn.

---

CHAP. II.—1-20. THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

1. *in those days.*] The historian refers to the birth of John the Baptist: ch. i. 80 is merely parenthetical and anticipatory.

*taxed.*] Or "enrolled," but for the purpose of taxation. On the census of Cyrenius, see note at the end of this chapter.

4. *Bethlehem.*] See on Matt. ii. 1.

*lineage of David.*] Compare ch. i. 27; iii. 23-31. Among the Jews, each family was reputed to belong to the place where its ancestors had been settled.

5. *with Mary.*] These words depend not upon "went up," nor upon "to be taxed" only, but upon the whole expression. The name of Mary, then, was to be enrolled, as well as that of her husband. This was in accordance with Roman, not with Jewish, usage. Olshausen supposes Mary to have been an heiress, and to have possessed land at Bethlehem. For this, however, there is no sort of evidence; and the supposition is in some respects an improbable one. It is much more likely that we ought to suppose that the census took place partly in the Roman and partly in the Jewish manner; Judæa not having yet been formally incorporated with the Roman empire.

*espoused.*] Or "betrothed." The Evangelist apparently intends to intimate what is more distinctly stated, Matt. i. 25 (Olshausen, Godet). The word *wife* is omitted by late editors and in the oldest MSS.

7. *first-born.*] Compare Matt. i. 25, where the two oldest MSS have *son* in place of *first-born*. It has been inferred from the use of the term in this and the parallel passage, that Mary became afterwards the mother of other children: but to speak of a "first-born" child (even though it were the only one) is in accordance with common usage. And it must be remembered that to the first-born male, a peculiar position was assigned in the Law (Exod. xiii. 2; xxii. 29). Even Renan holds that the proofs of our Lord being the only child of Mary are conclusive: see 'Les Evangiles,' p. 542.

*son . . . a manger.*] Or, "*a* babe lying in *the* manger," the word properly means a newborn babe; *the* manger, such as is regularly found in a stable. The inn was full, by reason of the concourse of people who had come to the small town of Bethlehem for the same purpose as Joseph and Mary. Caverns were often used for stables; and an ancient tradition mentioned by Justin Martyr related.

8 And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping [1]watch over their flock by night.

[1] Or, *the night-watches.*

9 And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid.

10 And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.

11 For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

12 And this *shall be* a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.

13 And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying,

14 Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.

15 And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us.

---

that the birth of Jesus had occurred in a cavern. A particular cavern was pointed out in later days as the scene of the Nativity, and a church was built over it by Helena, the mother of Constantine. Of course these traditions are incapable of verification, but they involve no inherent improbability.

8. *keeping watch, &c.*] Passages from the Talmud are quoted which shew that the calling of a shepherd was treated with a certain degree of contempt; their testimony was not admitted in courts of law, and they were classed with heathens. This statement, however, belongs to a later date, and probably to nomads rather than to Hebrew shepherds. If it were correct, this first preaching of the Gospel to the poor would have a two-fold significance. It is said that the flocks were sent out after the Passover, and brought in before the "former rain," *i.e.*, later in the autumn. Wieseler, however, has observed that this can only be understood of flocks sent to the distant pastures. Still the climate of the upland regions of Palestine, in the depth of winter, would not be favourable to a bivouac under the open sky; and a strong argument is thus drawn against the traditional date of the Nativity, whether Dec. 25 or Jan. 6. It has been lately shewn by Dr. Edersheim that sheep needed for the daily sacrifices in the Temple were fed near Bethlehem.

9. *came upon them.*] Suddenly; as is implied both in the original terms, and also in the (probably genuine) word "behold."

*were sore afraid.*] Literally, "**Feared with great fear.**"

10. *Fear not.*] Compare ch. i. 13, 30.

*to all people.*] "**To all the people,**" *i.e.* to Israel. The word here translated "people," and its Hebrew equivalent, are regularly used of Israel, in opposition to the "nations" or Gentiles. The announcement is national in its character, as befits those to whom it is made. Simeon (verse 32) foresaw the wider import of the Messiah's birth.

11. *Saviour.*] The name of Jesus is not given, but its meaning is represented by the word "Saviour" (Bengel).

*Christ the Lord.*] The predicted and expected Messiah, to whom the title of "The Lord" is particularly given; see Acts ii. 25. To a Jewish ear, "The Lord" would be the equivalent of the Divine Name, and we must suppose that the title is given to Christ, either as representing the majesty of Jehovah, or because He was of a Divine nature.

12. *a sign.*] "**The sign,**" *i.e.* that my words are true, and of the identity of the new-born child. The unusual sight of a child laid in a manger would be a sufficient token. See Bp. Andrewes, vol. i. p. 204.

13. *heavenly host.*] The army of angels which is represented as surrounding the throne of God: compare 1 Kings xxii. 19; Ps. ciii. 20, 21; cxlviii. 2. "This army nevertheless announces peace" (Bengel).

14. *good will toward men.*] This expression is highly significant: it corresponds exactly to that which is applied to our Lord Himself, "in whom I am well pleased," Matt. iii. 17. God has good will towards men, *i.e.* views them with entire complacency, because they are redeemed by His Son. This is the crowning result of the Incarnation. On the reading see Note at the end of the Chapter.

15. *the shepherds.*] Literally, "**The men,**" even "**the shepherds.**"

16 And they came with haste, and found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe lying in a manger.

17 And when they had seen *it*, they made known abroad the saying which was told them concerning this child.

18 And all they that heard *it* wondered at those things which were told them by the shepherds.

19 But Mary kept all these things, and pondered *them* in her heart.

20 And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they had heard and seen, as it was told unto them.

21 [a] And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called [b] JESUS, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb.

22 And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present *him* to the Lord;

23 (As it is written in the law of the Lord, [c] Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord;)

24 And to offer a sacrifice according to [d] that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons.

25 And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name *was* Simeon; and the same man *was*

[a] Gen. 17. 12.
[b] Matt. 1. 21.
[c] Ex. 13. 2. Num. 18. 15.
[d] Lev 12, 2, 6.

---

**19.** *But Mary.*] The silent meditation of Mary on these wonderful events is contrasted with the eagerness with which the shepherds tell their tale, and their neighbours receive it. Compare verse 51. This subjective statement has been regarded as an evidence that the Virgin was the real author of this part of the history (see on ch. i. ver. 5).

21–38. THE CIRCUMCISION AND PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE.

**21.** *eight days.*] Gen. xvii. 12.

*the child.*] "**Him,**" according to the reading of the best uncial MSS.

*which was so named.*] Ch. i. 31.

**22.** *the days of her purification.*] The law of purification after childbirth is given in Lev. xii. The mother of a male child was to be unclean for seven days, and the circumcision was to take place on the eighth day; after which the mother was to "continue in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days." At the conclusion of the entire period of forty days she was to offer a lamb for a burnt offering, and a young pigeon or a turtle dove for a sin offering. If the family were not rich enough to afford a lamb, two turtle doves, or two young pigeons were to be offered, the one for a burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering. In the case of a female child the ceremonies were the same, but the periods of uncleanness and purification were doubled. Instead of *her*, all the best MSS and early writers have *their* purification, a reading which presents some difficulty, and was probably altered on that account. The word "their" would imply that during the interval the members of a family were ceremonially unclean, the mother by childbirth, the others by daily contact.

*to present him.*] Another object of the journey to Jerusalem was to present the child (as a first-born male) in the Temple. The first-born male of every species was sacred to the Lord, in memory of the delivery of the first-born of the Israelites in Egypt (Exod. xii. 29, 30; xiii. 2). But the first-born male child was to be redeemed for money (Exod. xiii. 11-15; Numb. xviii. 15, 16), and the whole tribe of Levi was regarded as having been substituted for the first-born (Numb. iii. 12, 13).

**24.** *A pair.*] Lev. xii. 8. No mention here is made of the alternative lamb (see on verse 22), from whence it might be inferred that the Holy Family were poor: this accords with all other notices.

**25.** *Simeon.*] Or "**Symeon**" ("hearing"). Gen. xxix. 33. Some have attempted to identify this Simeon with the Rabbi Simeon, the son of Hillel, and the father of Gamaliel, who became president of the Sanhedrim A.D. 13. This is impossible. Hillel himself survived the birth of our Lord six years; the Simeon of the text is in extreme old age (verses 26, 29), and could not have undertaken the office of President of the Sanhedrim 17 or 18 years after this; he is introduced by the Evangelist as "a man in Jerusalem," which is scarcely consistent with the supposition that he occupied an important

just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel: and the Holy Ghost was upon him.

26 And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ.

27 And he came by the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law,

28 Then took he him up in his arms, and blessed God, and said,

29 Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word:

30 For mine eyes have seen thy salvation,

31 Which thou hast prepared before the face of all people;

32 A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of the people Israel.

33 And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

34 And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary his mother, Behold, this *child* is set for the [a]fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against;

[a] Isai. 8. 14. Rom. 9. 32.

35 (Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also,) that the

---

official station, although Alford observes in opposition to this that Gamaliel is simply called "one in the council, a Pharisee" (Acts v. 34); it is not said that he was, and the little we know of him does not fall in with the notion that he was, a scribe or doctor of the Law; lastly, the name of Simeon (often appearing in the New Testament in the form of Simon) was at this time extremely common among the Jews.

*just and devout.*] As Zacharias and Elisabeth (ch. i. 6). The former epithet refers mainly to the outward, and the latter to the inward religious character (Olshausen).

*consolation of Israel.*] The promised Messiah, and all that His coming should involve (compare verse 26).

*the Holy Ghost.*] "A prelude to Christian inspiration, since the Spirit (according to the Jews) had departed from Israel since the days of Malachi" (De Wette).

**26.** *was revealed.*] "**Had been foretold.**"

*the Lord's Christ.*] *I.e.* The Lord's Anointed; "The Messiah whom Jehovah gives and sends" (Godet).

**27.** *by the Spirit.*] Or **in**, *i.e.* in an inspired condition (compare Matt. xxii. 43; Rev. i. 10).

*to do, &c.*] Compare verses 23, 24.

**28.** *Then took he him.*] Or "**Then of himself he took him.**"

**29.** *now lettest thou.*] Because his death seemed now near and sure, since he had seen the Lord's Christ.

*thy word.*] Compare verse 26.

**30.** *have seen.*] **Beheld.**

**31.** *hast prepared.*] Literally, "**preparedst.**" The tense refers to a definite historical fact. Compare and see on ch. i. 47.

*all people.*] Rather "**all the peoples;**" divided in the following verse, into the Gentiles (to whom, as they sat in darkness, the Messiah was to be "a light") and Israel (whose "glory" the Messiah should be). Compare ch. i. 79.

**34.** *is set.*] Literally "**lies,**" but the meaning is correctly expressed by our version, as in Phil. i. 17: "is appointed," in God's Providence.

*fall and rising again of many.*] Or "**fall and rising of many,**" *i.e.* for the fall of many who now stand, and for the rising of many who now lie prostrate, "that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed." The Child was to be a touchstone of character, of faith, and of love. God's true, but hidden, servants would embrace Him; the hypocrites would reject Him. Probably there is an allusion to Isaiah viii. 14, 15" (De Wette). Thus the Christ would be "a sign that shall be spoken against" (He was Himself a sign to that generation, ch. xi. 30), and His life and teaching would promote violent opposition. Meyer observes the fulfilment of both predictions, the fall in the scribes and Pharisees, the rising again in publicans and sinners, both falling and rising again in St. Paul, cf. Rom. xi. 11, *seq.*

**35.** *Yea, a sword.*] Bleek (followed by Alford) sees in this a prediction of the struggle which would take place in the heart of the Virgin Mother before she would attain to perfect faith in her Son; in this case the parenthesis would belong chiefly to that which

thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.

36 And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser: she was of a great age, and had lived with an husband seven years from her virginity;

37 And she *was* a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served *God* with fastings and prayers night and day.

38 And she coming in that instant gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in [1] Jerusalem.

39 And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth.

40 And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him.

41 Now his parents went to Jerusalem [f] every year at the feast of the passover.

[1] Or, *Israel*.

[f] Deut. 16. 1.

---

immediately follows; and this interpretation is partly favoured by what follows, "that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed." But it is more natural to connect it with the immediately preceding clause. The opposition, which the pure life and doctrine of Jesus was to arouse, would cause bitter pain to His mother also. The text, however, applies in all its fulness to the mental torture which she would endure before the Cross (John xix. 25); so Bengel, Godet. Simeon had read in the prophets (Isaiah lii. 14; liii. 12) of a Messiah who was to suffer; we have here the first foreshadowing of the Passion to be found in the New Testament.

**36.** *Anna.*] In the O. Test., "Hannah" (1 Sam. i. 2).

*a prophetess.*] Compare verse 25. The expression implies that she was recognised as endowed with prophetic gifts; other prophetesses are named both in the Old and the New Testament, *e.g.* Judg. iv. 4; Acts xxi. 9.

*Aser.*] Or "Asher." A singular example of a member of one of the Ten Tribes being found in the Holy Land at this epoch.

*of a great age.*] Literally, "advanced in many days." Compare and see on ch. i. 7.

**37.** *of about fourscore and four years.*] We are probably to read "**unto fourscore and four years,**" *i.e.* of age. St. Luke relates of Anna that she lived seven years of married life (having been only once married), and continued in widowhood to the age of eighty-four. This accords with the common reading, which is correctly rendered in our version.

*departed not.*] The words of St. Luke may seem to imply that she spread her bed (or mat) in one of the corridors of the Temple, and made it her home (Godet): but the expression probably denotes assiduous attendance at all the services; cf. Acts ii. 46.

**38.** *gave thanks likewise.*] It is uncertain whether the word thus translated, which contains within itself the notion of *a response*, is to be explained in reference to the words of Simeon, to which those of Anna formed a sort of antistrophe (our translators have endeavoured to express this notion by the insertion of "likewise"), or whether, as seems more probable, the word is used because every giving of thanks is in answer to the blessings for which thanks are given.

*looked for redemption.*] Unto them who (in Jerusalem) looked for, or expected, redemption. Compare and see on verse 25.

**39.** *all things*, verses 23, 24.

### 40–52. Our Lord's Childhood, Youth, and Visit to the Temple.

**40.** *the child grew, &c.*] Compare ch. i. 80, where just the same thing is said of the Baptist. The words "in spirit" (*i.e.* "his spirit," see on ch. i. 80) are omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, with א B D L, and some ancient versions. They are found in A, in all other MSS, and many versions. On the one hand they may have crept into the text from ch. i. 80: on the other, they may have been omitted on theological grounds; but see verse 52. In the passage last referred to, and in this (if we retain "in spirit"), St. Luke speaks of the physical and moral development of the Son of man.

*grace of God.*] Compare John i. 14.

**41.** *went.*] Rather "**used to go.**" The Evangelist describes their habitual practice. In the case of Joseph, this was a matter of obligation (Exod. xxiii. 17): not so in that of his wife. But according to the tenets of the school of Hillel, women went up to the Passover, though not to the other two festivals, attendance on which was obligatory on males.

42 And when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast.

43 And when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and Joseph and his mother knew not *of it*.

44 But they, supposing him to have been in the company, went a day's journey; and they sought him among *their* kinsfolk and acquaintance.

45 And when they found him not, they turned back again to Jerusalem, seeking him.

46 And it came to pass, that after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions.

47 And all that heard him were

---

42. *twelve years.*] Among the later Jews, it was customary for the males to commence their attendance at the three great festivals, and their regular observance of ceremonial law at this age, at which they were called *Bene hattorah*, *i.e.* "sons of the law." The covenant relation to God, into which they had been admitted in infancy, was consciously realised and taken up at that age, in a manner which we are best able to understand when we consider the position of Confirmation in the economy of the Christian Church. This journey, then, of our Saviour with his parents to Jerusalem, was no casual event: it was a very solemn occasion, regarded by them and by Him as marking a critical epoch in His life. The whole history derives additional meaning from this consideration. We can also thus better understand why this single incident has been singled out from a long period of thirty years, and alone put on record.

*they went up.*] Apparently we should read and translate "**When they went up**" (another reading, less supported, would be more grammatical, "**When they were gone up:**" but that which we have adopted with Tischendorf and Tregelles, implies that they went up according to their own regular practice) **according to the custom of the feast and when they had fulfilled the days**" (the seven days of the Paschal feast; Exod. xii. 15), "**the child Jesus,**" &c.

43. *Joseph and his mother.*] Perhaps we ought to read "**his parents.**" The text may have been altered on theological grounds.

44. *company.*] A company (as the original word implies) of persons travelling together for mutual protection: a caravan. Such a body of travellers going together in the same direction, would of course contain many of their "kinsfolk and acquaintance."

*a day's journey.*] They continued their journey as far as the first night's resting-place, where they made sure of finding Jesus among their friends.

46. *after three days.*] It is questioned whether we are to understand that Joseph and Mary were three days in search of Jesus after their return to Jerusalem, or whether the first day's journey and the day of their return to Jerusalem are to be reckoned as two of the three days (so Grotius, Kuinöl, Oosterzee, Godet), or, lastly, whether the three days are to be counted from the day that He was missed, so that the day of His parents' return to Jerusalem will count for one, and He was found on the second day after their return. The second alternative seems most probable: it is difficult to suppose that they would have been three or even two days in Jerusalem without looking for Him in the Temple.

*in the temple.*] In one of the courts within the sacred precincts: perhaps in a synagogue which stood in the eastern portico, and in which the doctors expounded the Law. Jesus himself continually taught in the Temple (John xviii. 20).

*sitting in the midst of the doctors.*] It has been inferred from this statement that the teachers of the Law treated our Lord as one of their own body. But his position was that of a learner sitting at the feet of a teacher, seeking for instruction, and testing it by inquiry, as was customary among the Hebrews. Instances of such questioning may be found in every tract of the Talmud. Hillel, then a very old man, was the recognised head of the chief school, and was especially distinguished for his strict adherence to traditional principles; in his school the utmost deference was enjoined upon all learners. There is a later Rabbinical tradition, that before the death of Gamaliel scholars stood, and did not sit; but this is held by the best critics to be without foundation. At this our Lord's first appearance as 'a son of the Law,' He gave an example of teachableness, and earnestness in the search for truth. His questioning doubtless caused serious perplexity to the Doctors; but St. Luke's object is to present our Lord as a perfect model of all relative duties, then as throughout His life.

*both hearing them, and asking them ques-*

astonished at his understanding and answers.

48 And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.

49 And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?

50 And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them.

51 And he went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them: but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart.

52 And Jesus increased in wisdom and [1]stature, and in favour with God and man.

[1] Or, *age*.

---

*tions.*] He sought to enlarge His knowledge of God's Law, and at the same time displayed it. In the Rabbinical method of instruction, the teacher put a case or a problem bearing on the interpretation or application of the Law to be solved by his pupils. We have examples of such problems in the captious questions put to our Lord by Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. xxii. 15-46).

**48.** *Son, why, &c.*] A tender and gentle rebuke.

*thy father.*] She may not yet have revealed to Him the mystery of His birth; but the expression would necessarily have been used in speaking of Joseph.

**49.** *How is it that ye sought me?*] Or **"Why did ye seek me?"**

*about my Father's business.*] Or **"In my Father's house."** The text will bear either meaning. That of our version is adopted by Oosterzee, and apparently preferred by Godet, nevertheless in each case with a reference to *the affairs* of His heavenly Father which were transacted in the Temple. The local signification is taken by the Syriac and Armenian version, by Origen, Euthymius, Theophylact, Grotius, Hammond, Kuinöl, Meyer, Ellicott, De Wette, Bleek (but, in the case of the last two, without absolutely excluding the other). This is probably the true one: it follows most naturally on the previous question: and compare John ii. 16. The mother of Jesus had addressed Him as "Son" (verse 48), appealing to His filial relation to herself: she had even spoken of Joseph as His father. To this he answered, with a slight touch of rebuke, that they had found Him in His Father's house, where a son ought to be. Hilgenfeld ('Einl.' p. 556) calls attention to the natural way in which St. Luke first records the words of Mary, and then gives the distinct declaration of our Lord Himself, that His true Father is God.

**51.** *was subject.*] Even after the full recognition of His relation to His heavenly Father. Filial obedience, the foundation of all relative duties (see note above), was thus exemplified by our Master during by far the larger portion of His life.

*his mother kept, &c.*] Compare and see on verse 19.

**52.** *And Jesus increased.*] Compare verse 40, where, as here, but less distinctly, the Evangelist describes the intellectual as well as the physical development of Jesus in His human nature. The text contributes a weighty argument to the doctrine of the reality and perfection of Christ's humanity

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 2 and 14.

**2.** On the Census of Cyrenius.—The latest discussions on this question are by Schürer, 1874, 'Lehrbuch der neutest. Zeitgeschichte,' p. 262 to 215, and by Wieseler, in the 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1875, p. 535 to 549, who had previously dealt with it fully in his 'Chronological Synopsis,' 1843, and in his 'Beiträge,' 1869. Aberle also has an able review of Schürer's work in the 'Theologische Quartalschrift,' 1874. The subject has been more or less fully treated by Huschke, Köhler in Herzog's 'Real-Encyclopädie,' Weiszäcker in Schenkel's 'Bibel-Lexicon,' Hilgenfeld in his 'Zeitschrift für wissenchaftliche Theologie,' 1870, pp. 151 to 167, Ebrard, Caspari, Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' and Zumpt, 'Das Geburtsjahr Christi,' *i.e.* 'The year of our Lord's Birth,' 1869; and, of course, by all late commentators on St. Luke.

The question stands thus: Josephus states that Cyrenius, the Quirinius of Tacitus, 'Ann.' iii. 48, came to Judea as Imperial legate, and that in the year A.D. 6 or 7, he completed a census of the people: 'Ant.' xviii. 2. 1, cf. Lewin, 'F. S.' § 1021. The accuracy of this statement is not disputed. The com-

pletion of the census took place about ten years after our Lord's birth. St. Luke, on the other hand, connects a census under Cyrenius with the Nativity, and asserts that it took place in consequence of a decree of Augustus Cæsar, that the whole world should be taxed. To this several objections are raised, which have to be considered separately.

1. That such a general decree was issued at all is said to be improbable. But the fact does not rest wholly on the authority of St. Luke. Augustus was specially interested in the centralisation of Roman power; and it is expressly affirmed by Suidas (s. v. ἀπογραφή) that he adopted measures for a thorough registration of persons and property throughout the provinces. It is true that Suidas had St. Luke's words in his mind, but it is not less certain that he derived his information from independent sources.* Augustus, in fact, did but complete the survey of the whole empire, which had been undertaken by Julius Cæsar. A full account of the historical evidence for such an edict will be found in Wieseler; here it may suffice to state that historians, archæologists, and jurists,† of the highest authority, concur in maintaining the accuracy of the statement.

2. The next question is whether, admitting the fact of such an edict, it would be applicable to the kingdom of Herod. Schürer holds that Herod, as a Rex Socius, would not be subject to such an indignity. To this the answer is complete. Even had Herod, at the time in question, held the position of a Rex Socius, Augustus might have ordered a census. We learn, from an incidental notice in Tacitus, 'Ann.' vi. 42, that the Rex Socius of Cappadocia submitted to a census‡ some thirty years later. Herod, however, had forfeited his rank as a Rex Socius, in consequence of his support of Antony. After that time he had the inferior position of a Rex Amicus, a title which had a special significance, implying restoration to the rank of king (restitutus), but simply as a matter of personal favour, in absolute dependence upon the will of the Emperor.§ But, moreover, having incurred the displeasure of Augustus, in the year B.C. 7, he received a notification from the Emperor that henceforth he would be treated as a subject only.‖ Judæa was liable to tribute from the time of its subjugation by Pompey. This was the case with all subject nations, the only exception being that of some who were exempted simply on the ground of their poverty (βάρβαρα ἔθνη πενιχρὰ καὶ ἀκερδῆ, Appian, B. C. v.). According to Appian, Herod, who was previously procurator, was made king by Antony, but subject to a settled tribute.¶ No change was made afterwards; had a change been made, Josephus would naturally have recorded it; his silence, in fact, is an evidence of its continuance. It may be regarded as certain that the edict of Augustus applied to Judæa, in the time of Herod. It is further probable that, on receiving express intimation that it would be applied, Herod would at once take measures for its execution.

The next question touches the connexion between this registration and Cyrenius, or Quirinius.

All difficulty would be removed, if the rendering proposed by Wieseler, and defended with great ability in his three treatises on the subject, could be adopted. Instead of 'was first made when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria,' he translates the passage, which he accepts intact, thus, "before Cyrenius was Governor of Syria." The statement of St. Luke would be clear, and to the point. "This census must not be confounded with that which took place some ten years later, when Quirinius took possession of Judæa as an appanage to Syria, of which he was Governor."

The difficulty, however, of the construction thus proposed is obvious. It assumes (*a*) that πρώτη, first, is used in the sense of προτέρα, before: and (*b*) that it governs the following words, which the reader would naturally take to be the genitive absolute. (*a*) Of the usage "first," for "before," three instances are found in John i. 15, 30; xv. 18; and Fritzsche, on Rom. ii. p. 420, quotes passages from Ælian, Athenæus, and Chrysostom, which are conclusive as to its admissibility. Wieseler observes that philologists of the

---

* See Wieseler 'Beiträge,' p. 54.

† Savigny, Huschke, F. Ritschl, Petersen, Marquardt, and others are named by Wieseler, 'Beiträge,' p. 51.

‡ This is not conclusive. The position of the Cappadocian king at that time is not certain.

§ See Aberle, 'Theologische Quartalschrift,' 1874, p. 668 f.

‖ Joseph. 'Ant.' xvi. 11, 8. The words are explicit. Augustus says, πάλαι χρώμενος αὐτῷ φίλῳ, νῦν ὑπηκόῳ χρήσεται. The entire dependence upon Augustus is repeatedly noticed by Josephus: ἀνὴρ ὑπ' αὐτῷ πεποιημένος τὰ πάντα. Lewin, who quotes the former passage ('F. S.,' p. 169), thinks that the decree may have been issued in consequence of the Emperor's displeasure; it may certainly on that account have been enforced in Judæa—or menaced.

¶ Wieseler shews that Schürer misrepresents a statement of Josephus, Ant. xvii. 3, 5, who really asserts that the dominion of Archelaus, with its large tributes, was attached to Syria. See 'Studien u. Kritiken,' 1875, p. 541.

highest authority, Schömann, G. Curtius, and Ewald, hold it to be equally possible with that which is generally adopted. (*b*) Authority is also adduced for the construction of a participial clause after an adjective of time in the comparative degree, sufficient, it may be, in a case which presents no other difficulty, but hardly so in such a statement as that of our text.

The sentence, indeed, was understood by all early writers in what is certainly its obvious and natural meaning. The ancient versions are unanimous. Justin Martyr refers twice to the passage, and appeals, whether rightly or not, to the Roman registers of the census of Quirinius. We may dismiss the interpretation of Wieseler, not, indeed, as impossible, but certainly as improbable.

Two other explanations have stronger support, and are at least equally satisfactory.

We must bear in mind the certain fact that St. Luke refers distinctly to the census of Quirinius in his report of Gamaliel's speech, Acts v. 37. This is admitted by Schürer.* St. Luke there shews that he was well acquainted with the circumstances of the enrolment, which was the immediate cause of great disturbances, such as he knew did not occur at that time under Herod.† He could not therefore have confounded the two events: but inasmuch as his readers would be most familiar with the later one, which made a deep impression on the mind of all, marking a radical change in the condition of the Hebrew people, it was obviously important that he should refer to it in recording a similar transaction of far less importance to the nation.

Not less important are two words which St. Luke here uses, πρώτη, '*first*,' and ἐγένετο. The word 'first' has absolutely no sense, unless it refers to the preceding sentence, marking some peculiarity in the registration, the most obvious peculiarity being that of contrast. Again, the word ἐγένετο, 'took place,' or 'was carried into effect,' is not equivalent to ἦν, 'was,' the word which St. Luke would naturally have used had he intended to say, 'this was the registration under Cyrenius.'

The sentence, as it stands, tells us that this registration 'took place,' or 'was completed,' first (see further on) when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria. We have thus two statements. An edict was issued by Augustus: it was carried into effect under Cyrenius. St. Luke might of course have said 'this was not the enrolment under Cyrenius;' but that would have given a wrong impression; the enrolment was that which Augustus had commanded. Looking at the statement in the light of facts with which intelligent readers of St. Luke's Gospel must have been generally familiar, we have this obvious explanation. The decree went forth towards the close of Herod's reign that all the tributary states of the Empire should be subjected to a registration. That edict, as we have seen, applied to Judæa; it was not disobeyed. Herod had previously received a severe warning, and we may be assured that measures were at once taken by him preparatory to a registration.‡ Herod thus secured himself against the charge of disloyalty. But he had the strongest possible reasons to prevent the actual accomplishment. He was well aware of the religious and patriotic feelings of his subjects, which in fact caused a formidable outburst when the registration was effected. His influence at Rome, though it had been for a season impaired, was at that time sufficient to secure attention to the representations which he might address to Augustus; by making himself responsible for the full amount of tribute he would save himself from degradation, his people from a cruel insult, and the Emperor from a danger to which Augustus was specially sensitive, that of an insurrection in a country stirred by religious feelings. The execution was therefore, most probably, postponed, nor were any further steps taken until Judæa was reduced to the state of a province on the deposition of Archelaus.

To this explanation it is objected that πρώτη "first" is taken as equivalent to πρῶτον; but a slight modification in the rendering meets the grammatical difficulty, and leaves the sense intact. "This § a first enrolment was carried into effect when Cyrenius

---

* In the 'Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie,' 1876, p. 575.

† This is admitted by Holzmann, 'Z. f. w. Theologie,' 1873, p. 90.

‡ Had the census taken place according to Roman law each man would have been registered, not in the place where he actually resided, but in that where he was a citizen. If it took place according to Jewish custom, it would have been in connection with the tribe, and family, to which he belonged; this in the case of Joseph would involve a journey to Bethlehem, which would have been at once undertaken, if Herod, as we hold, issued orders for a registration on receiving the decree of Augustus.

§ The position of the word αὕτη in this sentence is somewhat peculiar. St. Luke generally places αὕτη after the noun; here it precedes the noun. This idiom he only uses when he wishes to mark a statement as emphatic; so that the meaning would be, 'as for this registration, a first one, it was completed,' &c.

was Governor of Syria." *I.e.* though contemplated, and actually prepared for under Herod, it was not completed, for reasons already considered, until the time of Cyrenius.

This view, which is ably defended by Köhler, Ebrard, and others, appears on the whole to be satisfactory. Of late, however, another solution has found acceptance with many considerable scholars both in England and in Germany. St. Luke is supposed to refer to a registration which took place, as is assumed, when Quirinius was first governor of Syria. The fact that Quirinius did hold that office twice appears to be established by a combination of notices. First, Tacitus states ('Annals,' iii. 48; A.U.C. 774) that Tiberius demanded a public funeral for Quirinius, on the grounds that he had been a distinguished soldier, and that after his consulate he had attained the honours of a public triumph for a victory over the Homodanenses in Cilicia. He must therefore at that time have been Imperial Legate in the province, in other words governor of Syria. This success, which refers to a previous period, is also noticed by Strabo, lib. xii. 6, 5. Secondly, in the year 1764 a fragment of a sepulchral inscription, now in the Museum of the Vatican, was found in the Tiber. It states that the person, to whose memory it was dedicated, was Proconsul of Asia, and that he was *twice* governor of the imperial province of Syria and Phœnicia. Mommsen, Merivale, and other historical critics of the highest authority, hold that the person thus designated was Quirinius. The date of the first appointment, accepting it as all but certain, may be thus determined. He was consul B.C. 12, and thus qualified for the office. We find, however, that after that date there were three other governors, M. Titius, C. Sentius, Saturninus, and P. Quinctilius Varus, up to the latter half of the year B.C. 4. Quirinius may have been then appointed; but he must have been recalled about Midsummer B.C. 2, when he was selected as monitor of Caius Cæsar.* It is therefore possible that a registration under his authority may have been held within that interval, and if so that St. Luke may have referred to it as a first registration.

To this it is objected that even assuming that Cyrenius was Governor of Syria in B.C. 4, it would be subsequent to the birth of our Lord, which Lewin places in B.C. 6: but granted the accuracy of the latter date, we may answer, as before, that St. Luke does not say that the decree of Augustus, which determined the proceeding in Judæa, was issued, but that this first census (emphatic) was carried into effect under Cyrenius.

Either of the foregoing explanations suffices to meet the charge of a misstatement on the part of an Evangelist who is especially careful in questions of contemporary chronology. The former seems to accord on the whole more completely with what we know of the relations between Herod, Judæa, and the Emperor; and with the fact that one registration only under Quirinius appears to have been known to early writers.

14. *good will toward men.*] This is a correct rendering of the received text; but a reading, strikingly different in meaning, has been lately adopted by critical editors; instead of εὐδοκία they have εὐδοκίας, *i. e.* "towards men of good will. The external evidences stand thus: in favour of εὐδοκίας the four principal uncial MSS, ℵ*, A, B*, D, the Vulgate, the old Latin, and the Gothic, which is derived from it, and the Latin Fathers. In favour of εὐδοκία all other MSS, uncial and cursive, all other old versions, including the Memphitic, which in doubtful readings usually agrees with the Vatican, and "the virtually unanimous evidence of the Greek Fathers, with an authority from which there is, or ought to be, no appeal." (Scrivener.) The passage quoted from Irenæus, iii. 10, 41, as favouring εὐδοκίας, on the contrary proves that he read εὐδοκία, "Qui suo plasmati, hoc est hominibus, suam benignitatem salutis de cælo misit." This requires εὐδοκία = divine benignity, or complacence. Origen, again, is cited in support of εὐδοκίας; but the passage, which we only know from Jerome's version, does not bear out the assertion. He uses the expression pax bonæ voluntatis, which in fact implies that he put εὐδοκία in apposition with εἰρήνη. In both cases, as a learned friend, Dr. Kay, observes, it is the quotation from a Latin version which causes obscurity.

If the sense thus supplied were at all satisfactory we might acquiesce in the general verdict of critical scholars, but the objections are insuperable. The new reading "utterly mars the rhythmical arrangement," and is scarcely intelligible. "Towards men of good will" has not been explained, so as to bring it into accord with biblical teaching; instead of an announcement of glad tidings to all mankind, such as the Pauline evangelist has the special privilege of recording, we find a limitation which no two commentators agree

* The authorities are given by Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri,' p. 132.

in defining. Bornemann again (Scholia in Lucam), has shewn that the construction ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας, however explained, does not accord with the laws of the Greek language, or with the usage of the N. T. For a full discussion of the question see Scrivener's 'Introduction to the Critical Study of the New Testament,' ed. 2, p. 513 seq. We have no hesitation in retaining the received text with its natural interpretation.

---

## CHAPTER III.

*1 The preaching and baptism of John: 15 his testimony of Christ. 20 Herod imprisoneth John. 21 Christ baptized, receiveth testimony from heaven. 23 The age, and genealogy of Christ from Joseph upwards.*

NOW in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituræa, and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene,

2 Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came

---

CHAP. III.—1–20. THE MINISTRY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

1. *Now in the fifteenth year.*] This may be regarded as the formal opening of St. Luke's history (compare Matt. iii. 1; Mark i. 2). The previous narrative was probably supplied to the Evangelist in a more or less complete form (see on ch. i. 5). True to his profession of accurate and orderly narrative (ch. i. 3, 4), Luke begins by giving the date which forms the *terminus a quo* of his continuous history. St. Matthew merely says, "In those days" (Matt. iii. 1); a very vague expression, especially when we remember that there is a gap of thirty years between the second and third chapter of this gospel. Throughout this Gospel and the Acts St. Luke shews that he was familiar with the historical literature of his age. This has been well shewn by Rösger, 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1877, and it is illustrated by a controversy between Schürer and Holzmann, in the 'Zeitschrift f. w. Theologie,' 1873, 1876, and 1877, the latter asserting, the former denying St. Luke's dependence upon Josephus. The coincidences between the two prove that they had access to common sources of information; the divergences shew their independence of each other. Renan holds that they were contemporaries at Rome, and probably connected with the members of the Herodian family dwelling in that city. A precarious view, but one which shews the impression made upon the mind of an able critic. See 'Les Évangiles,' p. 256. Renan does justice in that work to the beauty of St. Luke's style, see especially p. 283.

*Tiberius Cæsar.*] Augustus died Aug. 19, A.U.C. 767, having, however, associated Tiberius with himself in the imperial dignity, but only so far as regarded the provinces and armies, for two or three years previously. Consequently the date in the text will fall somewhere between the years A.U.C. 779 and 782.

*Pontius Pilate.*] See note on Matt. xxvii. 2.

*governor.*] Procurator, under the Proconsul of Syria.

*Herod.*] This is Antipas, a son of Herod the Great, and brother of Archelaus. See note on Matt. xiv. 1.

*Philip.*] Son of Herod the Great by Cleopatra (Joseph. 'Ant.' xvii. 1, 3). Not the Philip named in Mark vi. 17.

*Iturea.*] A region on the north-eastern borders of Palestine, in the direction of Damascus, deriving its name from Jetur the son of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 15). It is still called El-Jeidúr.

*Trachonitis.*] A district to the east of Ituræa, Batanæa, and Gaulonitis, bordering on the desert.

*Lysanias.*] This prince was probably a descendant of the Lysanias, king, not tetrarch, of Abilene, who had been put to death by Mark Antony, B.C. 36. (Lewin, 'F. S.') The Tetrarchy, at the time now in question, adjoined that of Herod Antipas, and was afterwards granted to Herod Agrippa, by Claudius, A.D. 41; Joseph. Ant. xviii. 6, 10. The existence of this Lysanias has been denied; but express mention of the Tetrarch Lysanias is made both in the passage of Josephus just quoted, and in a contemporary inscription found at Abila; see Boeckh, 'Corpus Inscr. Græc. III. 4521.' Renan mentions this denial as an instance of exaggeration, and refers his readers to the 'Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.' xxvi. 2ᵉ partie. See 'Les Évangiles,' p. 263, n. 2. A full account of the inscription is given in the 'Mission de Phénicie,' p. 316 *seq.*; where, however, Renan assumes that the

unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness.

[g] Matt. 3. 1.

3 [g]And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;

4 As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, [h]The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

[h] Isai. 40. 3.

5 Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways *shall be* made smooth;

6 And all flesh shall see the salvation of God.

7 Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, [i]O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

[i] Matt. 3. 7.

8 Bring forth therefore fruits [1]worthy

[1] Or, *meet for.*

---

Lysanias, who was put to death by Antony, was Tetrarch; it is clear from the account of Josephus that he was king. In Schenkel's Bibel-lexicon, *s. v.* Abilene, this fact is clearly shewn, and the identity of the Tetrarch with the Lysanias of St. Luke is satisfactorily established. See also Wieseler in the 2nd edition of Herzog's 'Real-Encyclopädie.' St. Luke thus gives a complete view of all authorities, secular and ecclesiastic, within the districts to which our Lord's ministry was confined. The Tetrarchy of Lysanias marks the extreme limit to the north-east.

*Abilene.*] Or the district of Abila. This was a town situated at the foot of the Antilibanus range, on its eastern side, and to the north-west of Damascus.

**2.** *being the high priests.*] Or, according to all the most important manuscripts, "**being the high priest.**" In theory, there could be but one high priest. Annas had held the office, and had been deprived of it by Valerius Gratus, Pilate's predecessor, who had also nominated and deprived in turn four high priests. Caiaphas, the present high priest, whose proper name was Joseph, was the son-in-law of Annas (John xviii. 13). Annas was probably regarded by the people as the real high priest, and as having been irregularly deprived. He certainly exercised great influence during the priesthood of Caiaphas (John xviii. 13-24). This is probably the true explanation of the singular expression here made use of by St. Luke. Renan notes it as a trace of coincidence between the third and fourth gospels; 'V. J.' 15me édition, p. 522. It must be added that St. Luke somewhat varies his form of expression from that made use of in relation to the secular potentate made mention of in verse 1. It is not simply "Annas and Caiaphas being high priest," but "in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas," yet so that the high priest is spoken of in the singular number.

*the word of God came unto.*] The solemn formula of announcing a Divine communication made to a prophet (compare 1 Kings xvii. 1; Jer. i. 2; Hos. i. 1). St. Luke thus agrees with St. Mark in representing the announcement by John the Baptist as the beginning of the gospel-tidings. See note on Mark i. 1

*in the wilderness.*] Compare ch. i. 80. St. Matthew (iii. 1, where see note) says more particularly, "the wilderness of Judæa," *i.e.* properly the barren and thinly peopled country near the western shore of the Dead Sea. In this, apparently, John had spent the years of his long retirement. But St. Luke tells us that he went into all the country about Jordan: the arid plains about the mouth of the Jordan. Compare John x. 40. Elijah had appeared with equal suddenness, from beyond the valley of the Jordan (1 Kings xvii. 1).

**3.** *the country about Jordan.*] The exact expression found in the LXX version of Gen. xiii. 10, for "all the plain of Jordan." St. John (i. 28, 29) speaks of John as baptizing in "Bethabara (or Bethania), beyond Jordan."

**4.** *The voice, &c.*] Isaiah xl. 3. Compare Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 3.

**5.** *Every valley.*] Added by St. Luke alone from Isaiah xl. 4, 5.

*straight.*] Or, as we probably ought to read, "**into straight ways.**" St. Luke lays special stress upon the obstacles to be encountered by the preachers of the Gospel, and he is careful to quote that part of the prophecy which declares the universality or the salvation offered to mankind. Both points are characteristic of the Pauline Gospel, and had doubtless been strongly impressed on the mind of Theophilus and his fellow disciples.

**7.** *Then said he.*] Literally, "**he said therefore.**" St. Luke seldom uses this connecting particle; and it is inferred (by Weiss) that, as usual, he took it from a document before him; a remark not without importance in its bearings upon St. Luke's method of composition.

*the multitude.*] Or "crowds." St. Mat-

thy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to *our* father: for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

9 And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: every tree therefore which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

10 And the people asked him, saying, What shall we do then?

11 He answereth and saith unto them, [b]He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise.

[b] Jam. 2. 15. 1 John 3. 17.

12 Then came also publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, what shall we do?

13 And he said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed you.

14 And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, [1]Do violence to no man, neither accuse *any* falsely; and be content with your [1]wages.

15 And as the people were [1]in expectation, and all men [1]mused in

[1] Or, *Put no man in fear.*
[1] Or, *allowance.*
[1] Or, *in suspense.*
[1] Or, *reasoned*, or, *debated.*

---

thew says, "many of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Matt. iii. 7). These were representative sections of the Jewish people, in whom their formalism and hypocrisy (on the one hand), and their evil heart of unbelief (on the other) appeared in their strongest developments.

8. *begin not.*] Instead of St. Matthew's "*think not*," St. Luke varies the idiom slightly, using an expression which occurs very frequently in this Gospel and in the Acts (forty-one times altogether); here it is emphatic, warning the people against any attempt at reliance on their national privileges. Compare John viii. 33-58; Rom. ii. 17-29.

*within yourselves.*] This implies an inward consultation, so to speak, with the heart, evidently with a view to quiet themselves touching the danger of judgment: as children of Abraham they felt secure. Even in torment the rich man appeals to "Father Abraham" for relief, ch. xvi. 24.

10. *the people.*] Or rather, "**The multitudes**," or "crowds," spoken of in verse 7, including, of course, the Pharisees and Sadducees, expressly mentioned by St. Matthew, as representing the religious world of that day, but consisting mainly of the great bulk of the people. This question, and those of the publicans and soldiers, are peculiar to St. Luke. There is a marked difference between the Baptist's answers to the several classes. Each man is subjected to a trial of his sincerity (compare ch. xviii. 22, 23). The penitent who exercised a despised and odious vocation, is simply told to do his duty in that vocation, and to resist the temptations incidental to it.

11. The first answer is general. It inculcates the primary duty of charity in a concrete and practical form. It is one of the passages held by some to indicate in parts of this Gospel an Ebionite tendency, which would be at variance with St. Paul's teaching, but it is essentially Christian, no mere test applied to professors and hypocrites, but a first condition of admission into the kingdom of God.

12. *what shall we do?*] Compare Acts ii. 37; xvi. 30.

14. *the soldiers.*] Or "men engaged in military service." What soldiers they were, is uncertain. They may have been in the service of Herod Antipas. But Judæa was now annexed to the Roman province of Syria, and we have examples of Roman soldiers coming under Jewish and (subsequently) under Christian influences, in ch. vii. 5; Acts x. 2, 7; and (probably) Philipp. i. 13.

*Do violence.*] Properly, "Shake violently," *i. e.* "Extort money by intimidation."

15. *And as the people.*] The "people" of Israel, generally. "They had not as yet so carnal a notion of the Messiah; for there was nothing of outward splendour about John; nevertheless they entertained these thoughts about him" (Bengel). St. Luke, who regards events in connexion with their historical causes, is the only one of the Synoptical Evangelists who mentions the popular expectation and various surmises current concerning John at this point. Thus the declaration of the Baptist, recorded also by St. Matthew (Matt. iii. 11, 12), is explained by St. Luke. St. John, however, relates that the Baptist was visited by a deputation of Priests and Levites from Jerusalem, whose enquiries betray the same expectation (John i. 19-28).

their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ, or not;

16 John answered, saying unto them all, [c]I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire:

[c] Matt. 3. 11.

17 Whose fan *is* in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable.

18 And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people.

19 [d]But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias his brother Philip's wife, and for all the evils which Herod had done,

[d] Matt. 14. 3.

20 Added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison.

21 Now when all the people were baptized, [e]it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened,

[e] Matt. 3. 13.

22 And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven,

---

**16.** *with water.*] St. Luke uses the same form as St. Mark, not "in water" as St. Matthew has it, but "with water," as the instrumental means: the two expressions express different aspects of the same truth. Lachmann adds, "unto repentance" (after C D); but the reading must have crept in out of the parallel passage in St. Matthew.

**18.** *And many other, &c.*] Properly, "**So he preached indeed many other things to the people, as he exhorted them; but Herod, &c.**" The word here, and generally, translated "preach," properly means "to proclaim good tidings;" here it seems to be used with allusion to the proclamation of the Messiah always involved, or referred to, in the Baptist's teaching (De Wette). The tense here used implies the Baptist's habitual practice.

*the people.*] *I.e.* Israel; compare and see on ch. ii. 10.

**19.** *Herod.*] Antipas: see on verse 1. The Baptist's imprisonment is mentioned by anticipation. We have here a striking instance of a characteristic of St. Luke's style, which has been previously noted, viz. his extreme care to avoid repetitions, and to save space by collecting and condensing notices of connected events. He thus clears off the history of John the Baptist's public ministry, before he commences that of our Lord. There is a marked antithesis between the preaching of good tidings ascribed to the Baptist in the previous verse, and his fate here related (Meyer).

*his brother Philip's.*] Late editors omit "Philip" with the two oldest MSS, but it is supported by others of high authority and by ancient versions. It is in St. Luke's style to give such an historical reference; and as Renan observes, he shews a remarkable familiarity with details relating to the Herodian family. See 'Les Évangiles,' p. 255.

**21.** *when all the people.*] Or, "**when all the people had been baptised, and when Jesus had been baptised and was praying.**" St. Matthew distinctly tells us that Jesus had "come up out of the water," when the heavens were opened (Matt. iii. 16). St. Luke briefly summarises the history which is given more at length in the first two Gospels. The accounts are quite consistent with one another, but evidently independent. Compare and see notes on Matt. iii. 15-17; Mark i. 9-11.

*praying.*] Mentioned by St. Luke only. This Evangelist also tells us that Jesus was transfigured "as he prayed" (ch. ix. 29), and that He ascended in the act of blessing the disciples (ch. xxiv. 50, 51). Compare also the notice of St. Paul in Acts ix. 11.

*the heaven, &c.*] According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, it would seem that the celestial phenomena were visible to Jesus Himself. St. John tells us that they were visible to the Baptist. St. Luke does not specify the persons by whom they were witnessed. It is not at all necessary to suppose that any others were present. The words, "when all the people had been baptized" (see above), may imply that the Baptism of Christ took place when John's ministry was drawing to a close.

**22.** *in a bodily shape.*] Added by St. Luke. See note on Matt. iii. 16.

*Thou art.*] So Mark i. 11. Matthew (iii. 17) says, "This is my beloved Son, in whom," &c. Compare also ch. ix. 35.

which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.

23 And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was *the son* of Heli,

24 Which was *the son* of Matthat, which was *the son* of Levi, which was *the son* of Melchi, which was *the son* of Janna, which was *the son* of Joseph.

25 Which was *the son* of Mattathias, which was *the son* of Amos, which was *the son* of Naum, which was *the son* of Esli, which was *the son* of Nagge,

26 Which was *the son* of Maath, which was *the son* of Mattathias, which was *the son* of Semei, which was *the son* of Joseph, which was *the son* of Juda,

27 Which was *the son* of Joanna, which was *the son* of Rhesa, which was *the son* of Zorobabel, which was *the son* of Salathiel, which was *the son* of Neri,

28 Which was *the son* of Melchi, which was *the son* of Addi, which was *the son* of Cosam, which was *the son* of Elmodam, which was *the son* of Er,

29 Which was *the son* of Jose, which was *the son* of Eliezer, which was *the son* of Jorim, which was *the son* of Matthat, which was *the son* of Levi,

30 Which was *the son* of Simeon, which was *the son* of Juda, which was *the son* of Joseph, which was *the son* of Jonan, which was *the son* of Eliakim,

31 Which was *the son* of Melea, which was *the son* of Menan, which was *the son* of Mattatha, which was *the son* of Nathan, which was *the son* of David,

32 Which was *the son* of Jesse, which was *the son* of Obed, which was *the son* of Booz, which was *the son* of Salmon, which was *the son* of Naasson,

33 Which was *the son* of Amina-

---

### The Genealogy.

**23.** *And Jesus, &c.*] Rather, "**And Jesus Himself was about thirty years of age when he began;**" *i. e.* at the commencement of His ministry. In accordance with his general tendency to careful chronological statement, St. Luke gives an indication of the date at which our Lord commenced His ministry. It is evident that, as the Baptism of Christ was His solemn inauguration and dedication to His office, the Evangelist intends to give His age at His Baptism. St. Luke says, "Jesus Himself," in contrast with the Baptist, "of whom he has previously been speaking" (Bengel).

*as was supposed.*] The importance of this notice is indicated by Scholten, who rejects it on the sole ground that it is incompatible with his notion that St. Luke held Joseph to be the true father of our Lord. Cf. Hilgenfeld, 'Einleitung,' p. 557, who recognises the fitness and genuineness of the statement. Renan takes it to be St. Luke's statement, though, as might be expected, he does not accept it as true. 'Les Évangiles,' p. 184, n. 2.

*the son of Joseph.*] For the comparison and criticism of the two genealogies of Christ, see note on Matt. i. 2.

**27.** *Zorobabel, which was the son of Salathiel.*] *I.e.* Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel. These two names also occur in the other genealogy in the same order. But St. Luke places them five generations further from David; as Hebrew names are frequently repeated, there may be nothing more than an accidental coincidence at this point. See Matt. i. 12.

**31.** *Nathan, which was the son of David.*] The two genealogies converge in David: and in Nathan, the son of David (2 Sam. v. 14), that of St. Luke first comes in contact with the Old Testament history. Compare Matt. i. 6.

Hilgenfeld (*l. c.*) observes truly (see note on Matt. p. 3) that in tracing the genealogy of our Lord up to David St. Luke omits the line of kingly ancestors. He supposes that our Evangelist wished to discourage the Jewish notion of the Messiah as King of Judæa. But St. Luke, as a true disciple of St. Paul, cf. Rom. i. 3, lays special stress on the descent from David.

**32.** *Salmon, which was the son of Naasson.*] *I.e.* Salmon (in 1 Chron. ii. 10 Salma), the son of Nahshon.

dab, which was *the son* of Aram, which was *the son* of Esrom, which was *the son* of Phares, which was *the son* of Juda,

34 Which was *the son* of Jacob, which was *the son* of Isaac, which was *the son* of Abraham, which was *the son* of Thara, which was *the son* of Nachor,

35 Which was *the son* of Saruch, which was *the son* of Ragau, which was *the son* of Phalec, which was *the son* of Heber, which was *the son* of Sala,

36 Which was *the son* of Cainan, which was *the son* of Arphaxad, which was *the son* of Sem, which was *the son* of Noe, which was *the son* of Lamech,

37 Which was *the son* of Mathusala, which was *the son* of Enoch, which was *the son* of Jared, which was *the son* of Maleleel, which was *the son* of Cainan,

38 Which was *the son* of Enos, which was *the son* of Seth, which was *the son* of Adam, which was *the son* of God.

## CHAPTER IV.

1 *The temptation and fasting of Christ.* 13 *He overcometh the devil:* 14 *beginneth to preach.* 16 *The people of Nazareth admire his gracious words.* 33 *He cureth one possessed of a devil,* 38 *Peter's mother in law,* 40 *and divers other sick persons.* 41 *The devils acknowledge Christ, and are reproved for it.* 43 *He preacheth through the cities.*

AND [f] Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness,

[f] Matt. 4. 1.

2 Being forty days tempted of the devil. And in those days he did eat nothing: and when they were ended, he afterward hungered.

3 And the devil said unto him, If thou be the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread.

4 And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.

5 And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, shewed unto

---

**33.** *Aram, which was the son of Esrom.*] *I.e.* Ram, the son of Hezron.

**34.** *Thara.*] Terah. St. Luke's Gospel is for all nations, and therefore carries up the genealogy of Christ from Abraham to Adam.

**35.** *Saruch . . Ragau . . Phalec.*] Serug, Reu, and Peleg.

**36.** *Cainan.*] This name is not found in the Hebrew text of Gen. xi. 12, although it appears there in the LXX version.

**37.** *Maleleel.*] Mahalaleel.

**38.** *Adam, which was the son of God.*] The Evangelist here asserts at once the community of nature which subsists between all mankind (compare Acts xvii. 26-28), and the filial relation in which all men stand to God, not merely as being the creatures of His hand, but also as being made in His image (Gen. i. 26, 27). "This last word of the pedigree is connected with its starting point. Unless the image of God had been stamped upon man, the Incarnation would have been impossible" (Godet). "All things are of God through Christ; and all things are brought back through Christ to God" (Bengel).

CHAP. IV.—1-13. THE TEMPTATION.

**1.** *full of the Holy Ghost.*] Which came upon Him in full measure at His Baptism (ch. iii. 22), and Which led Him into the wilderness. These words are peculiar to St. Luke, who uses a similar idiom in other passages of this Gospel and in the Acts, *e.g.* vi. 3; vii. 55; xi. 24. Here St. Luke fixes our attention upon the internal action of the Spirit; with this is contrasted the temptation which comes from without in words addressed either to the physical or the spiritual sense; the latter appears to be suggested by St. Luke's narrative.

*into the wilderness.*] See note at the end of the chapter.

**2.** *did eat nothing.*] Stronger and more precise than Matthew's "fasted," which it enables us to interpret.

**4.** *every word of God.*] St. Luke condenses the quotation which St. Matthew gives at full length from Deut. viii. 3.

**5.** *And the devil.*] On the order of the last two temptations, see note on Matt. iv.

him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time.

6 And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it.

7 If thou therefore wilt [1]worship me, all shall be thine.

[1] Or, *fall down before me.*

8 And Jesus answered and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

9 And he brought him to Jerusalem, and set him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence:

10 For it is written, He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee:

11 And in *their* hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.

12 And Jesus answering said unto him, It is said, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

13 And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season.

14 ¶ And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and there went out a fame of him through all the region round about.

---

5, 8. St. Matthew gives the chronological sequence, for which St. Luke here substitutes the order of ideas. He proceeds regularly from the temptation addressed to the natural appetites, through that of ambition, to the more refined and subtle temptation of pride. He inverts the order observed by the compilers of our Catechism in their classification of temptations: "The devil and all his works, the pomps and vanity of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh."

*in a moment of time.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. This addition makes it clear that the prospect was presented not to the bodily eye of the Redeemer, but to His spiritual sense.

6. *that is delivered.*] Compare John xii. 31; xiv. 30. St. Luke is careful to record these words, it being specially important that Gentile readers should understand that the power actually exercised by the Evil One was permissive, not, according to the dualistic notion, independent of the Divine will.

8. *Get thee behind me, Satan: for.*] The words are wanting in א, B, D, though found in A, and may have been brought in partly from the parallel passage in Matt. iv., and partly from Matt. xvi. 23, where the same words are addressed to Peter.

13. *all the temptation.*] Rather "**Every**" (*i.e.* every kind of) "**temptation.**" Satan had assailed the Saviour in every point of His human nature. See on verse 5; and compare Heb. iv. 15.

*for a season.*] So the same words are also rendered in Acts xiii. 11, where they yield a good sense. But here they more probably mean "**Until an** *appointed* **time;**" *i.e.* until his appointed time, or opportunity, should come,—spoken of Satan. Meyer treats the expression as subjective, *i.e.* as coming from Satan's point of view: he was "biding his time," as we say. The words seem to point to our Lord's own declaration, ch. xxii. 53; compare also John xiv. 30. The fulfilment is to be found in the agony in the Garden, and on the Cross. Bleek considers that the words embody a later reflection of St. Luke, and are written in the light of his historical knowledge. Oosterzee interprets them of the opposition raised against our Lord throughout His earthly career, of which the Temptation was merely a specimen. Historically, says this commentator, Satan's expectation was fulfilled, when he availed himself of later opportunities of assault, but mediately through the Pharisees (John viii. 13-59), and ultimately through Judas. Godet seems to take it, with Meyer, in a subjective sense (jusqu'à un moment favorable"); but says that if we are to seek a historical fulfilment, we must look for it in the agony in the Garden. On the whole, the view of the writer last referred to appears to be the most reasonable one.

14–44. Beginning of our Lord's Preaching in Galilee, specially in Nazareth and Capernaum.

14. *returned.*] To the country in which He had been brought up, as is recorded by St. Luke more fully than by the other Evangelists.

*in the power of the Spirit.*] Not *through* the power of the Spirit, but "full of the Holy Ghost" (De Wette; so Godet). Compare and see on verse 1.

*a fame.*] Not surely on account of the circumstances of His Baptism (which were

15 And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.

16 ¶ And he came to [a]Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read.

[a] Matt. 13. 54.

17 And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written,

18 [b]The Spirit of the Lord *is* upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised,

[b] Isai. 61. 1.

19 To preach the acceptable year of the Lord.

20 And he closed the book, and he gave *it* again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him.

21 And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.

22 And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, Is not this Joseph's son?

---

probably known only to Himself and to the Baptist), or His mysterious concealment for forty days (as Meyer), but for the reason assigned in the next verse (De Wette, Godet).

**15.** *And he taught.*] Or "**And He himself**" (as opposed to the mere rumour which had preceded His approach) "**continued teaching.**" On the order of events see note on Matt. iv. 13.

*being glorified.*] The honour which His teaching won for Him, accounts for the fame which had heralded His approach.

**16.** *And he came to Nazareth.*] With the following narrative compare Matt. xiii. 53-58; Mark vi. 1-6, and see the Note at the end of this chapter.

*where he had been brought up.*] An able writer has lately called attention to the confirmation which these words incidentally supply to the earlier portion of St. Luke's narrative. That was indeed the reason which induced Marcion, who is followed by a most unscrupulous critic (Scholten), to expunge them from the text. There can be no question as to their authenticity. See Hilgenfeld 'Einl.', p. 557, and Rösger in the 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1876.

*as his custom was.*] Compare Acts xvii. 2. This can hardly refer, as Meyer supposes, to our Lord's habit of attending the synagogue as a worshipper, which would not call for notice; but it implies that He was in the habit of reading and publicly expounding the Scriptures, probably before He left Nazareth, being then nearly thirty years old.

*stood up for to read.*] He offered to read and to expound; and signified this intention by standing up. This might be done by any member of the congregation. Compare Acts xiii. 15, 16; xvii. 2; xix. 8.

**17.** *opened.*] Literally, "**Unrolled.**"

*found the place.*] He opened the roll at that point.

**18.** *The Spirit.*] Isaiah lxi. 1, 2. The quotation nearly agrees with the LXX. But the words "To heal those that are broken in heart" are wanting in B, D, L: are bracketed by Lachmann, and omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles.

**19.** *the acceptable year.*] The year of God's special grace and favour.

**20.** *closed.*] Or "**rolled up.**"

*minister.*] The officer whose duty it was to bring the sacred volume to the reader, and to restore it to its place.

*sat down.*] They read the Holy Scriptures standing (an attitude of respect), and taught sitting (an attitude of authority).

**21.** *in your ears.*] Inasmuch as they heard His words addressed to them. It is evident from this and from the following verse, that our Saviour's discourse was not confined to the words here quoted. They rather give in brief the general drift of what He said, viz. that the passage read from Isaiah was truly fulfilled in Him. "Luke has recorded not the whole, but the substance" (Bengel).

**22.** *bare him witness.*] By expressing their wonder and admiration. The reason of their "wonder" is to be sought in the question at the end of the verse.

*gracious words.*] Literally, "words of grace."

*Is not this.*] Compare Matt. xiii. 54-56; John vi. 42.

23 And he said unto them, Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country.

24 And he said, Verily I say unto you, No [c]prophet is accepted in his own country.

[c] Matt. 13. 57.

25 But I tell you of a truth, [d]many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land;

[d] 1 Kings 17. 9.

26 But unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, *a city* of Sidon, unto a woman *that was* a widow.

27 [e]And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian.

[e] 2 Kings 5. 14.

28 And all they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath,

29 And rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the [1]brow of the hill whereon their city

[1] Or, *edge.*

---

**23.** *Ye will surely.*] "Surely," *i.e.* certainly. "You who have begun by expressing surprise at my teaching, will go on to express doubts about my mighty works."

*Physician, heal thyself.*] "Do something for thine own countrymen." So De Wette, after Theophylact, Euthymius, Grotius, and others. So also Bengel. Olshausen explains "Deliver yourself from your poverty;" Meyer, "If you desire to help others, first help yourself—do something to make yourself a reputation and to raise yourself from obscurity;" Godet, "You, who claim to be a saviour—a physician, do something for yourself, work a miracle here, and save yourself from being rejected by us." The first explanation is no doubt the true one. The expression "physician" is not to be pressed: it is a merely proverbial expression like our "charity begins at home."

*in Capernaum.*] St. Luke has not told us of any miracle wrought at Capernaum, or indeed of any miracle at all. But the words of Christ here imply that miracles had been wrought. "The phrase 'in the power of the Spirit' (verse 14) involves, as we have seen, a hint of miraculous acts performed during those first days, among which we must no doubt place the miracle at the marriage in Cana (John ii.). That miracle was followed by a sojourn at Capernaum (John ii. 12), during which Jesus may have wrought certain miraculous works" (Godet).

*country.*] Or "native city."

**24.** *And he said.*] Jesus had put an objection into the mouth of His hearers, and now proceeds to answer it. "No prophet is received in his own country (compare Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4; John iv. 44), as he is elsewhere; and it is God's way, to send His messengers to strangers, as in the case of Elijah and Elisha, who were sent to be the ministers of God's mercy to Gentiles." We have here an indication of St. Luke's feeling towards the Gentile world, such as we might expect to find in a Gentile convert of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

**25.** *Elias.*] Elijah: 1 Kings xvii. 8-xviii. 1.

*three years and six months.*] The same exact statement is found in James v. 17, and there may be an allusion to it in Rev. xi. 3, 6. In the original history (1 Kings xviii. 1) the language is more general: "The word of the Lord came to Elijah in the third year." But we do not know the *terminus a quo* from which "the third year" of 1 Kings xviii. 1, is reckoned. It may have been, as suggested by Olshausen (who is followed by Oosterzee) the flight of Elijah to Zarephath; and it may be also true that our Lord follows a current tradition to which He here gives His sanction.

**26.** *Sarepta.*] Zarephath, between Tyre and Zidon, to the latter of which cities it is said (here and in 1 Kings xvii. 9) to belong.

**27.** *Eliseus.*] Elisha: 2 Kings v.

**28.** *filled with wrath.*] They were indignant at His rejection of His countrymen which He points by citing the examples of the two great prophets. They may also have understood Him to hint that He had a mission even to the heathen.

**29.** *thrust him out.*] Drove Him out with violence.

*the brow.*] Or "**a brow**," according to a great preponderance of authority. "Two natural features," in the neighbourhood of Nazareth, "may still be identified" . . . . . "The second is indicated in the Gospel history by one of those slight touches, which serve as a testimony to the truth of the description, by nearly approaching, but yet not crossing, the verge of inaccuracy. 'They rose,' it is said of the infuriated inhabitants,

was built, that they might cast him down headlong.

30 But he passing through the midst of them went his way,

31 And came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the sabbath days.

32 And they were astonished at his doctrine: [f] for his word was with power.

[f] Matt. 7. 29.

33 ¶ [g] And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice,

[g] Mark 1. 23.

34 Saying, [1] Let *us* alone; what have we to do with thee, *thou* Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God.

[1] Or, *Away.*

35 And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and hurt him not.

36 And they were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word *is* this! for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out.

37 And the fame of him went out into every place of the country round about.

38 ¶ [h] And he arose out of the synagogue, and entered into Simon's house. And Simon's wife's mother was taken with a great fever; and they besought him for her.

[h] Matt. 8. 14.

---

'and cast Him out of the city, and brought Him to a brow of the mountain ..... on which the city was built, so as to cast Him down the cliff.' ... Most readers probably from these words imagine a town built on the summit of a mountain, from which summit the intended precipitation was to take place. This, as I have said, is not the situation of Nazareth. Yet its position is still in accordance with the narrative. It is built 'upon,' that is, on the side of, 'a mountain,' but the 'brow' is not beneath but over the town, and such a cliff ..., as is here implied, is to be found, as all modern travellers describe, in the abrupt face of the limestone rock, about thirty or forty feet high, overhanging the Maronite convent at the South-West corner of the town, and another at a little further distance." (Stanley, 'Sinai and Palestine,' ch. x.) One such cliff, about two miles from Nazareth, is shown as the "Mount of Precipitation."

*that they might cast, &c.*] Read, "**so as to cast.**"

**30.** *passing through.*] It is not very clear whether we are to understand that any miraculous event took place. Some consider that He so impressed His enemies, by the dignity of His appearance and manner, that they had not the courage to lay hold of Him, or to stop Him. De Wette and Meyer consider that a miraculous occurrence is intended: the former, with Olshausen and with ancient writers, generally understanding the Evangelist to mean that the inherent miraculous power of Jesus paralysed His enemies. This is, on the whole, the most probable explanation of the narrative.

31–41. SETTLEMENT AND FIRST MIRACLES AT CAPERNAUM.

**31.** *came down.*] Rather, "and **He** came down." A distinct paragraph begins with this passage; the word "down" refers to the situation of Capernaum on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias. Compare Matt. iv. 13. The following narrative (verse 31-37) is also found in Mark i. 21-28 (where see notes). It is not given by St. Matthew.

**32.** *with power.*] St. Mark (i. 22) says more particularly "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." The reception of Jesus by the Capernaites (verse 32) is in marked contrast to His reception by His own fellow-townsmen.

**35.** *and hurt him not.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. May we trace in this point of detail the hand of "the beloved Physician?" Compare and see note on verse 38.

**36.** See the note on Mark i. 27.

**38.** *And he arose.*] This short narrative is also found in Matt. viii. 14, 15, and Mark i. 29-31, where see notes. St. Matthew's account is very brief: he also mentions the miracle in a wholly different connexion. The accounts of St. Mark and St. Luke agree both as to the details of the miracle and as to the time when it occurred. St. Mark informs us that Andrew lived in the same house with Peter: St. Luke adds that James and John were present. St. Luke (the physician) alone tells us that the patient was "taken with a *great* fever," a technical expression, used by contemporary Greek physicians. He adds

39 And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and immediately she arose and ministered unto them.

40[e] ¶ Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them.

41 [f] And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking *them* suffered them not [1] to speak: for they knew that he was Christ.

[f] Mark i. 34.

[1] Or, *to say that they knew him to be Christ.*

42 And when it was day, he departed and went into a desert place: and the people sought him, and came unto him, and stayed him, that he should not depart from them.

43 And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent.

44 And he preached in the synagogues of Galilee.

---

other details. Jesus, he says, "stood over her, and rebuked the fever" (as he had just before rebuked the evil spirits; verse 35): St. Matthew and St. Mark inform us that He took her by the hand: these various details, thrown together, give a complete picture of the event. Finally, St. Luke alone informs us that the cure was complete at once, and that she rose and ministered to them *immediately*. Other examples of St. Luke's minute statement of medical or physiological details will be found in verse 35; ch. v. 12; ch. vi. 6; ch. xxii. 50, 51. Acts iii. 6-8; iv. 22; ix. 33; xxviii. 8.

**40.** *when the sun was setting.*] More full and picturesque than the account of St. Matthew (Matt. viii. 16, 17). The narrative agrees more closely with that in Mark i. 31-34, where see notes.

*laid his hands on.*] Again peculiar to St. Luke.

**41.** *And devils also.*] The exclamation ascribed to the evil spirits is added by St. Luke. Their knowledge of our Lord's true nature is given also in Mark i. 34.

*Christ.*] These words are omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, with ℵ, B, C, D, and a large preponderance of authorities: they are found in A, but are probably a gloss, explanatory of "The son of God," and connecting that phrase with "**the Christ**" in the following clause.

**42.** *And when it was day.*] With this and the two following verses compare (and see notes on) Mark i. 35-39 (where the narrative is substantially the same) and Matt. iv. 23.

*and the people, &c.*] Or "**And the multitudes kept seeking Him, and they came even unto Him**" ("did not give over seeking Him till they had found Him:" Bengel), "**and were for restraining Him that He might not depart from them.**"

**44.** *Galilee.*] On the reading, see Note below.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 1, 16, and 44.

**1.** *into the wilderness.*] Or according to another reading, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, "in the wilderness." This is preferred by nearly all critics; partly on the ground that it presents a difficulty of interpretation, chiefly because it is supported by MSS, which are at present generally followed, viz., ℵ B, L, and D an independent witness, also by some MSS of the early Italic and Vulgate, and by the Sahidic version. If adopted, it would be necessary to render the preceding words 'He was led about in the Spirit,' an expression which Weiss, who adopts the reading, admits to be strange and obscure. The reading, however, followed in our A. V. rests on the authority of all other uncial and nearly all cursive MSS, and all other ancient versions. It is certainly more intelligible, and accords better with the accounts of the other Evangelists.

**16.** The question whether this visit to Nazareth is identical with that recorded in the two preceding Gospels has been considered in the note on Mark vi. 1. In addition to the arguments there briefly adduced in support of the view that two separate visits are described, we would here call attention to a point of considerable importance in its bearings, both on this passage and on the general

structure of St. Luke's Gospel. In a work 'On the Object of the Evangelical History'* Storr first noted and established the fact that St. Luke observes throughout his Gospel a law which that critic calls *Sparsamkeit*, *i.e.* an extreme care to avoid repetitions. This occasions several remarkable omissions. When St. Luke found in the documents which he used two or more narratives of similar events he habitually passes over one or the other, even when the omission leaves a striking hiatus in the course of his own narrative. Resch, an able critic,† gives several clear instances of the operation of this rule.‡ In reference to the present question he observes, "Luke has omitted the account given in Mark vi. 1–6 (which Resch and other critics hold that St. Luke had before him), which describes the visit to Nazareth during our Lord's later ministrations in Galilee, because another of his sources supplied him with a similar account of a public appearance of Jesus at the commencement of His career in Galilee, which we find in Luke iv. 16–30." Among other striking exemplifications of this rule may be observed, (1) the omission of the account of the healing of a dumb man, recorded Mark vii. 31–37; because a similar transaction is related Luke xi. 14. (2) The curse on the barren fig-tree is omitted, though St. Luke had it fully before him in Mark xi. 12–14; 20, 21; because the lesson was conveyed by the parable which had been previously related by St. Luke xiii. 6–9. (3) The most remarkable of all such omissions is that of the last unction of our Lord at Bethany, which bears so strong a resemblance to that which our Evangelist had related at unusual length in ch. vii. 36–50, that it has been regarded as identical by some critics. (4) Thus also St. Luke omits the second feeding of the multitudes, Mark viii. 1–9; (5) the first of two healings of blind men, Mark vii. 22–26; (6) one most remarkable cure of demoniacs; and lastly, (7) a whole series of events related by St. Mark ch. vii. 24—ch. viii. 26; each event having parallels more or less corresponding in transactions which he has elsewhere related. (See note on Luke ix. 17.)

44. *Galilee.*] Here a singular reading is found in those MSS which late editors generally follow. Instead of τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ℵ B C L (C being an independent witness of high authority) have τῆς Ἰουδαίας, and they are supported by some other MSS of less weight, by the Coptic, and to some extent by the Syriac Peshito, versions. Yet the reading is rejected by nearly all critics, as irreconcileable with the narrative of the Evangelist. There can be no doubt that St. Luke in this passage follows St. Mark, whose very words he adopts in part; and it is certain that at the time in question our Lord's public teaching in synagogues was confined to Galilee. Such an instance of error should make critics pause in other cases where improbable readings are supported by one class of MSS. Here the reading may probably be accounted for as a mere error of transcription; but it seems strange that it should have been accepted by the able critics who superintended what may be called the Egyptian revision. They may have been influenced by the facts that St. Luke alone of the Synoptists has intimations of our Lord's ministrations in Judæa at a later period; and that throughout this gospel there are numerous indications of connexion with St. John's Gospel, which gives full accounts of our Lord's works and teaching in Judæa at an early period.

* Storr, 'Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte,' Tübingen, 1786.

† Resch has two articles in the 'Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie,' 1876, 1877, entitled "Pragmatische Analyse der grossen Einschaltung des Lukas."

‡ See Resch, *l.c.* 1876, p. 658 f.

## CHAPTER V.

1 *Christ teacheth the people out of Peter's ship:* 4 *in a miraculous taking of fishes, sheweth how he will make him and his partners fishers of men:* 12 *cleanseth the leper:* 16 *prayeth in the wilderness:* 18 *healeth one sick of the palsy:* 27 *calleth Matthew the publican:* 29 *eateth with sinners, as being the physician of souls:* 34 *foretelleth the fastings and afflictions of the apostles after his ascension:* 36 *and likeneth fainthearted and weak disciples to old bottles and worn garments.*

AND [a]it came to pass, that, as the people pressed upon him

[a] Matt. 4. 18.

CHAP. V.—1–10. THE CALL OF ST. PETER.

1. *And it came to pass.*] In this chapter it is certain that St. Luke does not observe a strictly chronological order. The conversion of St. Peter and three other disciples is transposed, since it had evidently taken place before our Lord's preaching in Capernaum, where our Evangelist agrees with the other Synoptists in representing Him as the guest

to hear the word of God, he stood by the lake of Gennesaret,

2 And saw two ships standing by the lake: but the fishermen were gone out of them, and were washing *their* nets.

3 And he entered into one of the ships, which was Simon's, and prayed him that he would thrust out a little from the land. And he sat down, and taught the people out of the ship.

4 Now when he had left speaking, he said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.

5 And Simon answering said unto him, Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net.

6 And when they had this done, they inclosed a great multitude of fishes: and their net brake.

7 And they beckoned unto *their* partners, which were in the other ship, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both the ships, so that they began to sink.

8 When Simon Peter saw *it*, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord.

---

of Simon Peter, ch. iv. 38. St. Luke must therefore have had a special object in grouping events which were separated by considerable intervals of time, and occurred in different places; compare *vv.* 1, 12, 16, 18. That object had probably reference to the general intention expressed in ch. i. 3, viz. to shew the certainty of the truths in which converts had been previously instructed. Each of the three miracles here recorded has a distinct spiritual significance and effect. The first, 1–11, seals the conversion of the disciples; the second, 12–15, symbolises cleansing from the defilement of sin; the third, 18–26, shews the immediate object of certain miraculous works, viz., attestation to the authority of the Son of Man. This has special importance in its bearing upon the principle of order, which here at least is evidently determined by other considerations than that of historical sequence. Still, even in this case there is a general coincidence, since the healing of the leper followed the call of the disciples, and preceded the miracle of healing which was wrought after the return to Capernaum.

*people.*] "**Multitude**," or "crowd."

*to hear the word of God.*] His preaching in the synagogues (ch. iv. 44) had excited so much attention that people followed Him to the shores of the lake to hear Him.

3. *Simon's.*] See ch. iv. 38. Jesus was pressed upon by the crowd (verse 1), and made use of the boat as a kind of pulpit, from which he could address all the people on the shore, without being personally inconvenienced by them. He "sat down" to teach, as in the synagogue at Nazareth, ch. iv. 19. Then He gave to Simon and the rest (some, at least, of whom had already numbered themselves among His disciples, cf. John i. 35-42) a sign which was at once an evidence of His own authority to teach, and an emblem of the service which He was about to call them to perform for Him. They had been already (at least to a certain extent) believers in Him; they were henceforth to be His ministers, to detach themselves from the world and from worldly occupations, to leave all and to follow Him.

4. *Launch out.*] Singular; addressed to Peter alone as the master of the boat: "let down" is plural, being addressed to all the men in the boat.

5. *Master.*] The word so rendered is commonly used by St. Luke as more intelligible to Gentiles than Rabbi; it is addressed to a superior, not (like Rabbi) in the narrow sense of "teacher," but as a more general term of respect. Both the use of this term, and the words which immediately follow, imply that St. Peter already saw in Jesus one of more than ordinary greatness.

6. *brake.*] "**Was breaking**," or "**began to break**."

8. *Depart from me.*] Properly "**Go forth away from me**:" *i.e.* "Go out of the boat and leave me." The wonderful event which he had just witnessed (whether a miracle of knowledge only, or a miracle of power, is much disputed, but to no purpose) had impressed Peter with the nearness of the Divine power. The sense of God's presence brought to his mind a strong feeling of his own sinfulness and infirmity: he felt that He who now stood before him, and in and through whom God had shewn forth His mighty power, was too pure and holy for him to draw near to. Compare Job xlii. 5, 6. He also calls Jesus "Lord," a term of greater reverence than "Master," verse 5.

9 For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken:

10 And so *was* also James, and John, the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.

11 And when they had brought their ships to land, they forsook all, and followed him.

[a] Matt. 8. 2.

12 ¶ [a]And it came to pass, when he was in a certain city, behold a man full of leprosy: who seeing Jesus fell on *his* face, and besought him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.

13 And he put forth *his* hand, and touched him, saying, I will: be thou clean. And immediately the leprosy departed from him.

14 And he charged him to tell no man: but go, and shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

15 But so much the more went there a fame abroad of him: and great multitudes came together to hear, and to be healed by him of their infirmities.

16 ¶ And he withdrew himself into the wilderness, and prayed.

17 And it came to pass on a certain day, as he was teaching, that

---

10. *James, and John.*] Here first named by St. Luke. See notes on Matt. iv. 21.

*unto Simon.*] In Matt. iv. 19 and Mark i. 17 these words are spoken to Simon and Andrew, a similar call being afterwards addressed to the two sons of Zebedee.

*thou shalt catch.*] Or "**thou shalt be catching**," the periphrastic form indicating the permanence of this occupation.

11. *forsook all.*] Their boats and nets, their trade, and even their homes and families. Comp. Matt. iv. 20, 22; Mark i. 18, 20; Matt. xix. 27, 29.

12–15. THE HEALING OF A LEPER.

12. *And it came to pass.*] The same narrative is found in Matt. viii. 2-4; Mark i. 40-45; where see notes. The accounts are substantially the same in each Gospel. St. Matthew places it immediately after the Sermon on the Mount, which, in his Gospel, follows (almost immediately) the calling of the four disciples. St. Mark (who takes no notice of the Sermon on the Mount, see note on Mark i. 45) mentions this miracle, like St. Luke, immediately after the calling of those disciples. But neither Mark nor Luke gives any note of time or place, except that the latter, as usual indifferent to geographical details, adds, that the event took place "in a certain city."

*a man full of leprosy.*] Peculiar to St. Luke the Physician. St. Matthew and Mark say, simply, "a leper." See note on ch. iv. 36. The leprosy taint had spread itself all over the man's body, but evidently not in the manner described in Lev. xiii. 13, since he was unclean, as appears from verse 14, and from the language of St. Matthew and St. Mark (see note on Mark i. 43).

13. *departed from him.*] "Luke gives the merely physical view of the event: Matthew says 'was cleansed,' using ceremonial language: Mark combines the two forms" (Godet).

14. *go, and shew thyself, &c.*] See Lev. xiv. 1-32.

15. *But so much.*] This verse has no parallel in St. Matthew: in St. Mark (i. 45) the same statement appears with slight variations of detail.

16. *And he withdrew, &c.*] Or, "**But he used to withdraw himself into the wilderness, and to pray.**" The Evangelist describes our Lord's practice. Compare and see note on ch. iii. 21.

17. *And it came to pass on a certain day.*] The following miracle is found in Matt. ix. 2-8, separated from the last by the healing of the centurion's son and of Peter's wife's mother, the stilling of the sea, and the casting out of the Legion and Mark ii. 1-2; where see notes. In St. Luke's account, the time of the occurrence is not hinted at: it took place on "one of the days." Our Evangelist agrees closely with St. Mark, inserting details which are omitted by St. Matthew; one instance among many of the special connexion between the second and third Gospels. Cf. Renan, 'Les Évangiles,' p. 258.

there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judæa, and Jerusalem: and the power of the Lord was *present* to heal them.

[b] Matt. 9. 2.

18 ¶ [b] And, behold, men brought in a bed a man which was taken with a palsy: and they sought *means* to bring him in, and to lay *him* before him.

19 And when they could not find by what *way* they might bring him in because of the multitude, they went upon the housetop, and let him down through the tiling with *his* couch into the midst before Jesus.

20 And when he saw their faith, he said unto him, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee.

21 And the scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this which speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone?

22 But when Jesus perceived their thoughts, he answering said unto them, What reason ye in your hearts?

23 Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Rise up and walk?

24 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins, (he said unto the sick of the palsy,) I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go into thine house.

25 And immediately he rose up before them, and took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his own house, glorifying God.

26 And they were all amazed, and they glorified God, and were filled with fear, saying, We have seen strange things to day.

[c] Matt. 9. 9.

27 ¶ [c] And after these things he went forth, and saw a publican, named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he said unto him, Follow me.

---

*there were Pharisees and doctors of the law.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. They had been attracted from various quarters by the fame of our Saviour's teaching, and they were "sitting" there to hear Him. Mark adds, that they were sitting in a house. He does not speak of the Pharisees and doctors of the law, but tells us that "many were gathered together" when "it was rumoured that He was in the house," and that "He preached the word unto them" (Mark ii. 1, 2).

*sitting.*] "As hearers more honoured than the rest" (Bengel).

*the power of the Lord.*] Not "the power of the Lord Jesus" (as Olshausen); but the power of the Lord God working in and with Him (Kuinöl, Meyer, Bleek, De Wette, Oosterzee).

18–26. THE HEALING OF THE MAN SICK WITH THE PALSY.

**18.** *And, behold.*] Literally, "**and behold men bringing in a bed,**" &c. The phrase is vivid: it calls attention to a new fact.

**20.** *when he saw their faith.*] That of the sick man and of those who had brought him. Similarly St. Mark (ii. 5) who also gives the evidence of their faith. St. Matthew recites the same formula (ix. 2) "seeing their faith," but the special instance of faith given by St. Mark and St. Luke is there wanting. St. Matthew hastens on to give the saying of Jesus to which the circumstance led, and therefore, as usual, omits details, nevertheless preserving a form of expression which presupposes one of the details omitted by him.

**21.** *and the Pharisees.*] Added by St. Luke. He has accounted for the presence of Scribes and Pharisees, verse 17.

**24.** *I say unto thee.*] To *thee*, emphatically. Jesus had addressed His words to the Scribes and Pharisees. He now turns suddenly to the paralytic.

**25.** *glorifying God.*] Added by St. Luke.

**26.** *We have seen.*] Or "**We saw.**" St. Matthew merely tells us that the bystanders "glorified God." St. Mark makes them to say "We never saw it on this fashion:" substantially the same comment with that recorded by St. Luke.

27–29. THE CALL OF ST. MATTHEW.

**27.** *went forth.*] St. Mark adds, "by the sea side," and that "all the multitude resorted unto Him and He taught them."

*Levi.*] St. Mark gives him the same name, adding that he was "the son of Alphæus."

28 And he left all, rose up, and followed him.

29 And Levi made him a great feast in his own house: and there was a great company of publicans and of others that sat down with them.

30 But their scribes and Pharisees murmured against his disciples, saying, Why do ye eat and drink with publicans and sinners?

31 And Jesus answering said unto them, They that are whole need not a physician; but they that are sick.

32 I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

33 ¶ And they said unto him, [d] Why do the disciples of John fast often, and make prayers, and likewise *the disciples* of the Pharisees; but thine eat and drink?

[d] Matt. 9. 14.

34 And he said unto them, Can ye make the children of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?

35 But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days.

36 ¶ And he spake also a parable unto them; No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old; if otherwise, then both the new maketh a rent, and the piece that was *taken* out of the new agreeth not with the old.

37 And no man putteth new wine into old bottles; else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish.

---

In the parallel passage of the first Gospel we find the name of Matthew. That name appears in the four catalogues of the Apostles, Matt. x. 2-4; Mark iii. 16-19; Luke vi. 14-16; and Acts i. 13. See notes on Matt. ix. 9, and Mark *l.c.*

**28.** *left all.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. Comp. verse 11.

**29.** *a great feast.*] St. Luke alone says so in express terms, but it is implied in the other narratives.

*and of others.*] St. Matthew and St. Mark say "and sinners."

30–35. Cavils of the Pharisees.

**30.** *their scribes and Pharisees.*] *I.e.* The Scribes and Pharisees of that place.

*against his disciples.*] In Matthew and Mark the complaint is addressed *to* the disciples but *against* their master. St. Luke's account is not inconsistent. The charge which the Pharisees brought against Him, they brought against His followers also. In our Lord's reply St. Mark and St. Luke omit St. Matthew's quotation from Hos. vi. 6.

**33.** *And they said unto him.*] That which follows, to the end of the chapter, is also found in the first two Gospels in the same context and position (Matt. ix. 14-17; Mark ii. 18-22; where see notes). The accounts agree substantially (though not in all cases verbally), with one striking exception. St. Luke puts the question contained in this verse into the mouth of the Scribes and Pharisees at Levi's banquet, who had just spoken; St. Matthew makes certain disciples of John ask the question; St. Mark apparently represents the question as proceeding from the disciples of John and the Pharisees; see note on Mark ii. 18.

*and make prayers.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. We may most naturally understand the expression as referring to formal prayers at stated times, such as form part of any ascetic system: Comp. ch. xi. 1; Matt. vi. 5. Our Lord does not touch on this point in His reply; and it is probably for this reason that the words are omitted by the other Evangelists (Oosterzee).

The Parables of the Garment and the Bottles.

**36.** *And he spake also a parable unto them.*] This preface to the "parable" or proverbial saying, is only found in St. Luke. The remainder of the verse, which varies somewhat from the parallel passages in St. Matthew and St. Mark, is probably to be read and rendered as follows: "**No man teareth a patch from a new garment and putteth it on to an old garment: but if otherwise,** (*i.e.* if he does) **he will both tear the new, and the piece which was taken from the new will not agree with the old.**" In Matthew and Mark the mischief is simply that which is done to the hitherto uninjured part of the old garment: in Luke there is a twofold evil, the new garment is spoiled for the sake of the old one, and the

38 But new wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved.

39 No man also having drunk old *wine* straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is better.

## CHAPTER VI.

1 *Christ reproveth the Pharisees' blindness about the observation of the sabbath, by scripture, reason, and miracle:* 13 *chooseth twelve apostles:* 17 *healeth the diseased:* 20 *preacheth to his disciples before the people of blessings and curses:* 27 *how we must love our enemies:* 46 *and join the obedience of good works to the hearing of the word: lest in the evil day of temptation we fall like an house built upon the face of the earth, without any foundation.*

[a] Matt. 12. 1.

AND [a]it came to pass on the second sabbath after the first, that he went through the corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing *them* in *their* hands.

2 And certain of the Pharisees said unto them, Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the sabbath days?

3 And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungred, and they which were with him;

4 How he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shewbread, and gave also to them that were with him; which it is not lawful to eat but for the priests alone?

5 And he said unto them, That the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.

---

patch does not suit the latter. Oosterzee observes that this figurative teaching drawn from wine and garments was suitable to the "great feast" at which our Lord was speaking: so also Bengel.

**39.** *No man also.*] This addition is peculiar to St. Luke. It is omitted in one uncial MS, D, and in early Italic versions, apparently also by Eusebius, perhaps in consequence of the *primâ facie* difficulty of reconciling it with the foregoing parable. The "new wine," as before, is the doctrine of Christ. In verses 37, 38, Jesus had shewn that His teaching could not be conveyed in the old forms and with the old machinery of the Law. He now apologises, as it were, for those who, having become habituated to another religious system, were unable as yet to accept that which He came to introduce. The time was one of transition, and those who were unable to relinquish their hold upon the past were to be dealt tenderly with. So Euthymius, Theophylact, Olshausen, Meyer, Godet, Oosterzee. De Wette objects that old wine not only seems, but really *is* better; whereas the old doctrine was inferior to the new. The answer is that the point of the similitude lies in this, that the old wine is most agreeable to the taste of those who are accustomed to it. The true reading probably is "**And no man having drunk old wine desireth new**" ("straightway" having been inserted by some one who understood the meaning of the figure, and wished to bring it out more strongly), "**for he saith, the old is good,**" an expression which implies entire satisfaction. In this case there is no opposition between the old and the new wine, on the ground that one is regarded as in itself better than the other: all that is said is, that men are unwilling to give up that to which they are accustomed.

CHAP. VI. **1.** *on the second sabbath after the first.*] The following occurrence (verses 1-5) finds place in Matthew (xii. 1-8), who introduces it with a note of time ("at that time") immediately after the conversation with the disciples of John (Matt. xi. 1-19), and in Mark (ii. 23) in the same connexion in which it appears in the text. See notes on the parallel passages in SS. Matthew and Mark. The principal variations are as follows. Matthew and Mark say simply "on the Sabbath day;" St. Luke (if the reading is genuine) says "**on the second-first Sabbath.**" But the word which we have so rendered is wanting in א B L and some MSS of less authority, and is accordingly rejected from the text by Tregelles, and marked as doubtful by Lachmann. The omission would bring the text into complete accordance with the parallel passages. For this very reason it appears most probable that the word is genuine. The omission of a difficult word, not found in Matthew and Mark, is easily accounted for: to account for its insertion into the text of Luke is not so easy. The word probably means the first Sabbath in the second month; see note on Mark ii. 23.

Other variations of statement between St.

*f* Matt. 12. 9.

6 *f* And it came to pass also on another sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man whose right hand was withered.

7 And the scribes and Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath day; that they might find an accusation against him.

8 But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth.

9 Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing; Is it lawful on the sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy *it?*

10 And looking round about upon them all, he said unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he did so: and his hand was restored whole as the other.

11 And they were filled with madness; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus.

12 And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God.

---

Luke and the first two Evangelists may be here noted. He adds, by way of explanation, that the disciples rubbed the ears of corn with their hands. The Pharisees, in Matthew and Mark address themselves to Jesus, in Luke they speak to the disciples (although the words "unto them" are omitted in the oldest MSS). The account taken from 1 Sam. xxi. 6 is given somewhat more fully by St. Mark than by either of the others. Both St. Mark and St. Luke omit the reference to the ministration of the priests on the Sabbath quoted in Matt. xii. 5, 6, as well as the citation from Hos. vi. 6, which is found in Matt. xii. 7. Lastly, neither St. Matthew nor St. Luke have the saying recited by St. Mark (ii. 27) that "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." In all these variations, however, no real inconsistency is involved.

7–12. Miracle of Healing on the Sabbath.

**6.** *And it came to pass also.*] This miracle (verse 6–11) also occurs in the same position in St. Matthew (xii. 9–13), and St. Mark (iii. 1–6). See the notes on those passages. The account in the text, more full than St. Matthew's (though omitting the question about a sheep fallen into a pit, Matt. xii. 11) agrees as usual most closely with St. Mark's.

*the synagogue.*] St. Luke does not say *what* synagogue. St Matthew implies (xii. 9) that this miracle occurred in the same place where the disciples had plucked the ears of corn. See note on Mark iii. 1.

**9.** *I will ask you one thing; Is it?*] Or, as we are probably to read, "**I ask you whether it is,**" &c. This question placed the cavillers in a dilemma. With the received reading, however, the passage might be rendered, either as in the Authorised Version, or thus "I will ask you, What is lawful on the Sabbath days? to do good or to do evil?" &c.

**10.** *looking round about.*] Or, "**when he had looked round about,**" &c. St. Mark adds "with anger." The tense marks a pause, a moment of indignant silence.

*whole as the other.*] The word "whole" is probably inserted from the parallel passage in St. Matthew; so also in Mark iii. 5, where see note. The three last words of the verse are also marked as doubtful by Lachmann and Tregelles, and are omitted by Tischendorf and others.

**11.** *And they were filled.*] St. Luke briefly summarises what the first two Evangelists tell us with more detail; Matt. xii. 14; Mark iii. 6: see note on passage last referred to.

**12.** *in those days.*] St. Luke, as usual indifferent to topographical details, omits to mention the retirement of Jesus to the seaside, related by St. Mark (iii. 7–12), and referred to by St. Matthew (xii. 15–21) as having taken place in consequence of the plots of His enemies against Him. See note on Mark iii. 7. He proceeds at once to the appointment of the Twelve Apostles, related by St. Mark (iii. 13–19) in the same order, but by St. Matthew (x. 1–42) before the conversation with John's disciples, and the discourses in answer to cavils about the Sabbath.

*a mountain.*] Rather "**the mountain:**" so in Matt. v. 1 and Mark iii. 13, where see note. The object of this special prayer and communion with God was evidently connected with the choice which He was about to make from among His followers of men who were to be specially set apart to do His work. There are slight apparent variations here between the three accounts. St. Matthew says that He

13 ¶ And when it was day, he called *unto him* his disciples: [a] and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles;

[a] Matt. 10. 1.

14 Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew,

15 Matthew and Thomas, James the *son* of Alphæus, and Simon called Zelotes,

16 And Judas [b] *the brother* of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor.

[b] Jude 1.

17 ¶ And he came down with them, and stood in the plain, and the company of his disciples, and a great multitude of people out of all Judæa and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, which came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases;

18 And they that were vexed with unclean spirits: and they were healed.

19 And the whole multitude sought to touch him: for there went virtue out of him, and healed *them* all.

20 ¶ And he lifted up his eyes on

---

called to Him His twelve disciples: St. Mark, that He called to Him whom He would, and ordained twelve: St. Luke that He called to Him His disciples and of them chose twelve. St. Mark's account is virtually the same as St. Luke's: St. Matthew's can be explained by regarding it as a condensation of the others: he does not specify the selection of the twelve from among a body of disciples who were present at the time. St. Luke alone tells us that Jesus gave the twelve chosen disciples the title of Apostles, or "emissaries." It is not clear whether we are to understand that this title was given them at the time, or, as seems more probable, at some later period. All that the words of the text certainly prove is that the title was given by Jesus Himself.

13–16. APPOINTMENT OF THE TWELVE.

**14.** *Simon.*] Comp. Matt. x. 2-4; Mark iii. 16-19; Acts i. 13.

**16.** *Judas the brother of James.*] Literally, "James's Judas," whether brother or son, cannot be concluded from this place. The same names appear in the corresponding place in Acts i. 13. In Matthew x. 3 we find "Lebbæus surnamed Thaddæus" (the reading is very doubtful: see note on that place), and in Mark iii. 18. "Thaddæus," occupying the place of this Judas.

**17.** *came down.*] From the mountain mentioned in verse 13, on which He was when He called to Him His disciples and ordained the twelve Apostles from among them. See note on Matt. v. 1.

The recital which follows (verse 17-19) is found with more detail in Mark iii. 7-12 (where see note), before the mention of Christ's going up to the mountain.

*which came.*] Or, "which were come."

**19.** *sought to touch.*] Comp. ch. viii. 43-48. At this point in the narrative St. Luke departs from the order observed by St. Mark. He evidently follows a different set of documents, one which contained discourses of our Lord partly recorded by St. Matthew, partly independent of the first Gospel. The section thus inserted, extending from ch. vi. 20 to ch. ix. 4, contains (1) the Sermon on the Plain, differing in some important particulars from the Sermon on the Mount in St. Matthew; (2) and sundry events in the eighth chapter, of which the historical sequence presents some difficulties. Nor does St. Luke coincide with St. Mark until he gives an account of the parables in the ninth chapter. The entire section has special characteristics of St. Luke's Gospel; discourses and transactions which bring out in strong relief peculiar features of our Saviour's Personality; the style differs from that of the early portion, which is full of Hebraisms, and from that of the narrative which agrees most closely with St. Mark; on the other hand, critics have remarked striking resemblances between this and the great section, extending from ch. ix. 51 to ch. xviii. 15. These variations of style are peculiar to St. Luke; they are best accounted for by his close adherence to the sources which he follows; although in many passages he evidently uses his own language, which was that of an educated man familiar with the best writings of his age.

20–49. THE SERMON ON THE PLAIN.

**20.** *And he lifted up.*] On the general question of identity between this discourse, sometimes called the 'Sermon on the Plain' (verse 17) and the Sermon on the Mount in Matt. v.-vii., see note on Matt. v. 1. At present the following brief comparison between the two discourses, or recitals of the same dis-

[b] Matt. 5. 3.

his disciples, and said, [b] Blessed *be ye* poor: for your's is the kingdom of God.

21 Blessed *are ye* that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed *are ye* that weep now: for ye shall laugh.

22 Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you *from their company*, and shall reproach *you*, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake.

23 Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold, your reward *is* great in heaven: for in the like manner did their fathers unto the prophets.

24 [c] But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation.

[c] Amos 6. 1.

25 [d] Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep.

[d] Isai. 65. 13.

26 Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets.

27 ¶ [e] But I say unto you which

[e] Matt. 5. 44.

---

course, will suffice. St. Matthew and St. Luke both begin with the Beatitudes, the latter in an abbreviated form. To them St. Luke subjoins a like number of corresponding woes. The discourses on the spiritual application of the Law, and on Almsgiving, Prayer, and Fasting, recited in Matt. v. 17–vi. 18, are wanting in St. Luke, who, however, gives immediately after the Beatitudes a discourse on forgiveness, which appears in St. Matthew as part of our Lord's modification of the *lex talionis*. The remainder of St. Luke's "Sermon" contains a condensed recital of the portion of the Sermon on the Mount which is found in Matt. vii. interspersed with sayings found in St. Matthew's Gospel in other connexions. It may be said in general terms that the discourse on St. Luke keeps more closely, than the Sermon on the Mount, to the main subject, of which the key-note is struck in the Beatitudes, that is to say the blessedness of suffering, resignation, and self-renunciation.

*Blessed be ye poor.*] St. Matthew adds "in spirit" (Matt. v. 3). In this and the following beatitudes, St. Luke speaks *in terms* only of earthly sufferings. But the general tone of the discourse shews that they are taken as symbols of the inward frame of soul which they are naturally the means of bringing about. "The poor" are continually spoken of in the Psalms in the sense of the humble and trustful servants of God. Renan, who looks upon the words in St. Matthew as an addition to the genuine tradition, nevertheless admits that the original term implied a religious idea, "une acception pieuse et presque mystique," 'Les Évangiles,' p. 196, note 1. It may be added that the beatitudes and woes are here *addressed to* the various classes, not, as in St. Matthew's recital, *said of* them.

*kingdom of God.*] St. Matthew says "Kingdom of heaven," the Hebrew phrase, altered by St. Luke, as being less intelligible to Gentile readers.

**21.** *hunger now.*] "Hunger and thirst after righteousness" in Matt. v. 6. See on verse 20.

*that weep now.*] In Matt. v. 4, "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." The antithesis in the text is sharper and more vivid.

**22.** *Blessed are ye, when men.*] Substantially identical with the last beatitude in Matt. v. 11, 12. "When they shall separate you [from their company]," *i.e.* cast you out of their synagogues (compare John xvi. 2) is the equivalent of "persecute you" in St. Matthew's report.

**24.** *But woe.*] These four woes, which are peculiar to St. Luke, are in all respects the antitheses of the corresponding beatitudes. Jesus, as before, directly addresses the classes of whom He is speaking; but we need not therefore suppose that they were present. By a vivid rhetorical figure He places them, as it were, before the eyes of His hearers. He is thinking of the rich and powerful classes at Jerusalem, who would be the opponents of His teaching: see on verse 27.

*ye have received.*] "Ye have it to the full,"—"Ye have all your consolation." Compare ch. xvi. 25.

**25.** *are full!*] "**Have been filled,**" or "satisfied."

**26.** *Woe unto you, when.*] A warning to the disciples themselves.

**27.** *you which hear.*] Our Lord now turns from the two classes whom He has been apostrophising, to His actual hearers. But we seem to see in these words a vestige of the formula "but *I* say unto you," with which Jesus introduces the same saying in Matt. v. 44, and which would be out of place in St. Luke's report. The remainder of the discourse falls into three sections, 1. the law

hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you,

28 Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you.

29 [f] And unto him that smiteth thee on the *one* cheek offer also the other; [g] and him that taketh away thy cloke forbid not *to take thy* coat also.

[f] Matt. 5. 39. [g] 1 Cor. 6. 7.

30 Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask *them* not again.

31 [h] And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.

[h] Tob. 4. 15; Matt. 7. 12.

32 [i] For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them.

[i] Matt. 5. 46.

33 And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same.

34 [k] And if ye lend *to them* of whom ye hope to receive, what

[k] Matt. 5. 42.

---

of charity, manifested in readiness to forgive and to do good (verses 27-38); 2. a warning against hypocrisy and hollow religion (verses 39-45); and 3. an exhortation to be "doers of the word" (verses 46-49). The first of these sections occurs in Matt. v. 39-48 as parts of our Lord's exposition of the Law; the latter part of the section being found in Matt. vii. 1, 2, with an insertion which will be noted in its place. The second and third sections are abbreviations of the corresponding parts of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii.) with certain insertions, to which attention will be called when they occur. The question now arises, what is the connexion between the first of these portions and the "woes" which immediately precede it? De Wette, who sees in verses 20-26 only external evils and advantages, and supposes them to refer to the persecutions which Christians endured, considers that what follows is intended to teach them the duties of forgiveness and resignation under the evils which they suffered at the hand of their enemies: so also Meyer. But, as Godet remarks, the rich, &c. are not denounced in the woes as persecutors, neither are the disciples, in verses 27, 28, &c., especially commanded to love, bless, and pray for the rich. The fact is that in this Gospel we appear to have a condensed report, and the links of connexion have fallen out. St. Luke has here brought together, and thrown into one, two only of our Lord's modifications of the Law, which are found in Matt. v., being just those which set forth most prominently the "new commandment" of love.

*Love your enemies.*] Matt. v. 44. From the sayings there recorded the text is slightly condensed. It there occurs in the explanation of Lev. xix. 18, as interpreted by the Jews of our Lord's time.

**29.** *And unto him that.*] Condensed from the sayings recorded in Matt. v. 39, 40, where they occur in connexion with the *lex talionis.*

*that taketh.*] Or "**that is taking,**" *i.e.*, "is seeking to take." Compare and see notes on Matt. v. 40, where, however, the relative position of the "cloke" and the "coat" are inverted. St. Luke's is the more logical arrangement, the coat (the *chiton* or tunic) being the inner and more indispensable part of dress. St. Matthew explains (what St. Luke omits to notice) that legal oppression is here intended (compare 1 Cor. vi. 1-8).

**30.** *Give to every.*] Compare Matt. v. 42, from which St. Luke's recital is slightly varied.

**31.** *And as ye would.*] St. Matthew places this "golden rule" in a later portion of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 12) where it appears more naturally as the conclusion of one of the divisions of the discourse. In St. Luke's order, it somewhat breaks the connexion.

**32.** *For if ye love.*] Or "**And if ye love.**" The following passage (verses 32-36) occurs in a rather different, and less logical, order, in Matt. v. 45-48, where it is closely connected with the passage parallel to verses 27, 28. Compare, and see notes on the passage just referred to. Differences of detail will be noted as they occur.

*what thank.*] St. Matthew says in the parallel passages, "what reward." The same questions appear between the appeal to the example of our heavenly Father (verse 35; Matt. v. 45) and the exhortation to follow it (verse 36; Matt. v. 48).

*sinners.*] St. Matthew had "publicans."

**33.** *And if ye.*] For this and the following verse St. Matthew (v. 47) has, "And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?" St. Luke's recital marks a gradual climax—"to love," "to do good," "to lend without hope of repayment."

thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again.

35 But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and *to* the evil.

36 Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful.

37 [l] Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven:

[l] Matt. 7. 1.

38 Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again.

39 And he spake a parable unto them, [m] Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch?

[m] Matt. 15. 14.

---

35. *hoping for nothing again.*] This rendering, which is adopted by almost all commentators, suits the context perfectly. See Note at the end of the Chapter. Bengel observes that the three precepts in this place, "love," "do good," and "lend, hoping for nothing again," look back to verse 32, verse 34, and verse 34 respectively.

*and ye shall be.*] Somewhat modified and condensed from the passage given fully in Matt. v. 45. Meyer explains, "ye shall be the children of the Highest, in the kingdom of the Messiah," and compares ch. xx. 36. This explanation misses the point of the promise. It is a present, not a future reward, which is *here* offered, as well as in the parallel in Matt. v. 45, the reward of being *truly* (*i.e.*, in spirit and in character) children of our heavenly Father: compare Eph. iv. 31–v. 1.

36. *Be ye therefore merciful.*] This concluding precept is substantially the same as in Matt. v. 48, where (however) it is more strongly (and if it is right so to speak) paradoxically expressed. Oosterzee observes that we can imitate God's moral perfections only, and that His love is the centre of those perfections. The oldest MSS and late editors omit "therefore."

37. *Judge not.*] Or "**and judge not.**" Compare with this passage (verses 37, 38), Matt. vii. 1. Between this and the foregoing verse there lies in St. Matthew's recital the whole of the sixth chapter. See note at the end of this chapter. The report of St. Luke, however, is here much more full than the parallel passage of St. Matthew, and yet, while it appears at first sight to introduce new matter, it is identical in principle. "Judge" here is not equivalent to "condemn" as is shewn by the use of that word in the next clause: and yet the use of the word in that place, with the succeeding exhortation to forgiveness, throws light upon the sense in which we are forbidden to judge. "Judge not," *i.e.*, in a hard, sharp, condemnatory spirit. With the whole, compare Matt. xviii. 21-35.

*forgive, and ye shall be forgiven.*] Rather, "**Absolve and ye shall be absolved.**" It does not so much mean that we are to forgive personal offences, as that we are to pass a sentence of acquittal on the offender, in order that a favourable judgment may be passed upon us.

38. *Give, and it shall be given unto you.*] St. Luke's recital makes a rapid transition from the negative to the positive working of the law of charity. Liberality may be taken as the symbol of this aspect of charity; so that "charity," with us, has come to stand for "almsgiving" in common language. Godet observes that "there is strong feeling displayed in this sequence of imperatives, and the promise which follows is marked by a singular redundancy of expression. It has been said, 'Give to God with your hand full, and He will fill your bosom in return.' The sense of this infinite liberality of God is vividly expressed by the accumulation of epithets."

*shall men give.*] Or "**shall they give;**" surely, not (as Euthymius) "those who have received benefits from you," but those, whoever they may be, who shall serve as the agents of God's bounty to you. The verb is, in fact, impersonal.

*into your bosom.*] The loose folds of the dress above the girdle, which served as a pocket. The image here is clearly taken from corn.

*For with the same measure.*] Compare and see on Mark iv. 24.

39. *Can the blind.*] This image does not occur in the parallel passage in St. Matthew, but is found in Matt. xv. 14, where it is used of the traditional teaching of the Pharisees. De Wette says that it is wholly out of place

n Matt. 10. 24. 1 Or, *shall be perfected as his master.* o Matt. 7. 3.

40 n The disciple is not above his master: but every one 1 that is perfect shall be as his master.

41 o And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

42 Either how canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.

43 p For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.

p Matt. 7. 16.

---

here, and that it has no connexion with the context. Meyer also refuses to see any connexion between this and the foregoing verse. It is in fact introduced by a special heading, from which it might be inferred that our Lord is passing on to a different subject. Yet there is a certain connexion. Jesus has warned His disciples against "judging," because it is, or is in danger of being, uncharitable. He now warns them against judging, because their judgment may be given with imperfect knowledge and on insufficient grounds. He therefore makes use of the same parabolic expression which occurs in Matt. xv. 14, but with a somewhat different reference. There, the teacher is said to be as blind as the scholar; here the judge is said to be as blind, nay as weak and sinful, as he whom he judges: thus the expression is connected both with what goes before, and with that which follows in verses 41, 42.

**40.** *The disciple is not.*] The words occur in a slightly varied form in Matt. x. 24, 25, where they are used to signify the opposition and persecution which the followers of Christ must expect to meet with in the world. Here, they must be taken closely with the foregoing verse, and read in the light of it; neither is there really any difficulty in supposing sayings, proverbial in their form, to have been uttered on different occasions in different bearings. Jesus says in effect, "The blind cannot lead the blind better than he can guide himself: the scholar will not be better than his teacher: the judgment which one sinful man passes on another, can never raise the standard of moral excellence in the world."

*but every one that is.*] Rather, "**But when made perfect every one like as his teacher.**" So De Wette, Olshausen, and the marginal rendering in our Authorised Version. "The rule is, that the disciple is as his master" (Oosterzee).

**41.** *And why.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. vii. 3-5, where the passage is found, in the corresponding part of the Sermon on the Mount, in nearly the same form.

**43.** *For a good tree.*] With this (verses 43-45) compare the strictly parallel passage in Matt. vii. 15-20 (where, as here, our Lord is speaking of the influence of teachers), and a similar one in Matt. xii. 33-37 (where He is answering the cavil of the Pharisees). The reference in the text is to teaching, with which the idea of judging (verse 37, &c.) is closely connected. In fact, our Lord here reverts to what He had said verse 40, "The disciple is not above," *i.e.* better than, "his master." The fruits here spoken of, are not the doctrines or the lives of the teachers, but their influence over those who are brought under their teaching. Unless the heart is thoroughly reformed within, the contact between the teacher and the taught, or (in reference to verses 41, 42) the moral judgments which one man passes on the conduct of others, can only produce injurious consequences. This truth is expressed in a series of parabolical and proverbial sentences, some of which occur elsewhere in different connexions (so Meyer, Godet, and others).

The succession of thoughts throughout is something like this. "Do not judge hastily. Do not judge with a predisposition to condemn; but let your leaning be all the other way (verses 37, 38). After all, what is your judgment worth? Can it raise the character of those with whom you have to do? To do that, you must begin by reforming yourself. The blind cannot lead the blind; but like teacher, like scholar (verses 39, 40). Before correcting others, correct yourself; you will be better able to do it, as your moral vision will be purified (verses 41, 42). Indeed, every attempt to influence the character and conduct of others, unless our own heart is changed for the better, will be in vain. Like can only produce like even in the natural world (verses 43, 44). It is equally so in the moral world, and let a man try never so much to guide and influence others for good by his words, yet his words will reflect his true character, since the mouth utters that of which the heart is full" (verse 45). Thus the passage is closely connected with that which immediately precedes it. With verse 43 compare Matt. vii. 16, 17.

44 For every tree is known by his own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes.

45 A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh.

46 ¶ [g] And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?

[g] Matt. 7. 21.

47 Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will shew you to whom he is like:

48 He is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it: for it was founded upon a rock.

49 But he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great.

---

44. *For every tree.*] Compare Matt. xii. 33; vii. 16.

45. *treasure of his heart.*] These words are omitted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, and placed in brackets by Lachmann, on the authority of א B D L. They are found in A C.

*for of the.*] Matt. xii. 34, where it immediately precedes the clause which it here follows.

46. *And why call ye me.*] We have in the remainder of St. Luke's recital (verses 46-49) a condensed report of that which appears more fully in Matt. vii. 21-27, as the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount. Verse 46 is a caution against a mere profession of personal devotion which does not touch the springs of action. In the parallel passage of St. Matthew it is expressed by the introduction of what may be considered as a parable or a prophecy like that in Matt. xxv. 31-46.

47. *Whosoever cometh.*] The remainder of the chapter is substantially the same with Matt. vii. 24-27 (where see note), though with slight variations of expression and imagery. Among other differences, it is cast more nearly into the form of a parable: *e. g.* in the use of the past tense. "On the slopes which surround the Lake of Gennesareth there are places where a shallow bed of soil or of sand covers the rock. The wise man trenches, and trenches deep, until he has found the rock, on which he lays his foundation" (Godet). St. Matthew adds to the danger of the "flood" (the suddenly swollen torrent rushing down from the neighbouring hills) the wind which actually accompanies a violent storm of rain. We have here, as in St. Matthew's report, the appropriate conclusion of the whole discourse.

48. *for it was founded upon a rock.*] Or, possibly, "Because it was well built." The MS authorities are almost equally divided, but it is possible that the form in the text has been transferred from the parallel passage in St. Matthew.

---

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 35, 37.

Ἀπελπίζω, an ἁ. λ. in the N. T., occurs in the LXX, once in Isaiah xxix. 19, and four times in the Apocrypha. In Isaiah the pass. perf. is used, *οἱ ἀπηλπισμένοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, אביוני אדם, evidently in the sense "reduced to hopelessness"; this would imply the active meaning, "deprive of hope," the sense which is adopted by the Syriac, "and disappoint—or frustrate not—the hope of any man"; so, too, the Arabic and Persian. Isaiah ought not therefore to have been quoted, as by Grimm, Achelis, and others, in support of the meaning "ceasing to hope." In Judith ix. 11 we have the same form, ἀπηλπισμένων σωτήρ. In three other passages the meaning is "losing hope," despairing. The passages quoted by Wetstein, *in loc.*, leave no doubt as to the general usage in later Greek, viz. ceasing to hope.

The rendering of the Syriac, Arabic, and Persian finds a new and strong support in the reading of א; and two other good MSS, adopted by Tisch. ed. 8, and W. H., sc. *μηδένα*, which involves the rendering "frustrating no one of hope." Such may be the meaning of the Coptic version, where the Greek verb is transcribed and followed by a particle meaning either aliquem or aliquid;

here far more probably *aliquem—do not disappoint any one*, as the Arabic in Tattam's edition renders it.

The objections to the rendering nihil desperantes, found in D and in some early Italian MSS, are considerable, if the reading μηδένα be accepted. They are very strong even with the reading μηδέν. There is the want of connexion with the context. In v. 34, our Lord says, "if ye hope to receive of them," this rendering would present an opposite and irreconcileable sense: "never ceasing to hope for anything." It is evident that the two sentences present a sharp antithesis: "do not give, hoping to receive again;" "lend, hoping not to receive anything." Meyer's explanation is striking, "accounting nothing which ye give as really lost;" but it gives a new sense to the verb, and is equally open to the fatal objection of unsuitableness to the context.

The fitness of the A. V. is unquestionable. It has a strong support in the Vulgate, "nihil inde sperantes." No instance has been adduced of such a meaning of this verb, but a somewhat similar usage may be drawn in other compounds with ἀπό; the preposition being in construction separated from the verb, and attached to a word implied in the sense. Hoping for nothing from *them*. The fact that some ambiguity might arise is well illustrated by a passage in Athenæus, in which ἀπεσθίειν is used in both senses. A guest who is requested to "cease eating," understands that he is asked to eat of the bread. This usage is shewn by Casaubon, defended by Bengel, and by Achelis, 'Bergpredight,' pp. 466, 8, who quotes also Dem. c. Arist. 61, and Aristoph. Av. 26. If this construction be accepted as probable, the rendering of the A. V. should be retained, as the only one which accords thoroughly with the context. If, on the other hand, μηδένα be the true reading, the rendering of the Syriac, Arabic, Persian, probably the Coptic also, seems preferable to that adopted by Grimm and Meyer.

**37.** The omission of the whole sixth chapter of St. Matthew, assuming the two evangelists to refer to the same discourse, may be accounted for satisfactorily by St. Luke's characteristic habit of avoiding repetitions. He records in ch. xiv. 14, a warning against ostentation: there it is drawn out by the context; and in this passage it may be remarked that St. Matthew's text is full of allusions to Hebrew customs, certainly not likely to be adopted by Gentile converts, who would need rather to be warned against backwardness than over-display in their devotions. St. Luke reserves this warning for the strong denunciations of Pharisaism in ch. xi. 42-44. Thus, too, the subject of prayer is dealt with in ch. xi. 2-4; the light of life (Matt. vi. 22, 23), in ch. xi. 34-36, where it is suggested by the contrast; ch. vi. 24 is given in Luke xvi. 13; and the warning against over-anxiety, ch. vi. 25-34, is found in Luke xii. 22-30.

It may certainly be inferred that the omission does not imply that St. Matthew added to his text; but that Luke, as usual, reserves a part for other occasions when the sayings would be required. The latter part was specially called for when the decisive breach with the world was completed.

---

# CHAPTER VII.

1 *Christ findeth a greater faith in the centurion a Gentile, than in any of the Jews:* 10 *healeth his servant being absent:* 11 *raiseth from death the widow's son at Nain:* 19 *answereth John's messengers with the declaration of his miracles:* 24 *testifieth to the people what opinion he held of John:* 30 *inveigheth against the Jews, who with neither the manners of John nor of Jesus could be won:* 36 *and sheweth by occasion of Mary Magdalene, how he is a friend to sinners, not to maintain them in sins, but to forgive them their sins, upon their faith and repentance.*

NOW when he had ended all his sayings in the audience of the people, [r] he entered into Capernaum.

2 And a certain centurion's ser-

[r] Matt. 8. 5.

---

CHAP. VII.—1-10. THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.

**1.** *entered into Capernaum.*] This entry into Capernaum, with the miracle which follows immediately, is placed by St. Matthew also after the Sermon on the Mount, though, in that Gospel, the healing of the leper (recorded also ch. v. 12-14) is mentioned between.

**2.** *And a certain.*] The following narrative (verses 2-10) agrees in substance, with certain variations of detail, with Matt. viii. 5-13, where see notes. The main difference lies in this, that in the text the centurion is represented as sending a body of Jewish elders (doubtless elders of the synagogue; so Godet, against De Wette, Meyer and Oosterzee: see especially verse 5) and afterwards a party of his own friends: whereas St. Matthew says that the centurion came himself. The recital of this history had probably assumed this con-

vant, who was dear unto him, was sick, and ready to die.

3 And when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto him the elders of the Jews, beseeching him that he would come and heal his servant.

4 And when they came to Jesus, they besought him instantly, saying, That he was worthy for whom he should do this:

5 For he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue.

6 Then Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof:

7 Wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed.

8 For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers, and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth *it*.

9 When Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned him about, and said unto the people that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

10 And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole that had been sick.

11 ¶ And it came to pass the day after, that he went into a city called Nain; and many of his dis-

---

tracted form (*Qui facit per alium, facit per se*) before it was committed to writing.

*servant.*] Or "**slave.**" St. Luke thus explains the word used by St. Matthew viii. 6, in the Greek *my child*, which might mean either *my son*, or as in this and many other passages *my slave*, cf. ch. xii. 45; xv. 26: he adds that he "was dear unto him," ("because of his obedience, verse 8," says Bengel), a point not mentioned by St. Matthew.

*ready to die.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. St. Matthew says, "sick of the palsy, grievously tormented."

**3.** *when he heard.*] He had no doubt heard of His miracles. This mission of the elders, and, of course, the reasons which they urge on behalf of the centurion, are peculiar to St. Luke.

*the elders.*] "**Elders,**" omitting "the."

**5.** *a synagogue.*] **The** *synagogue*, the only synagogue in the city, that in which our Lord preached, was thus the gift of a Gentile soldier.

**6.** *went.*] Or "**was going.**" The second mission, which follows, finds no place in St. Matthew's Gospel.

*I am not worthy.*] The word implies "unfitness," rather than personal unworthiness: doubtless as a Gentile and alien from Israel. The peculiar character and position of the centurion as a Gentile, and at the same time a lover of Israel, have a strong bearing upon the objects chiefly contemplated by St. Luke, and as shewing at once special interest in Gentiles, and agreement with the other Evangelists in describing the relations between them and Israelites. The passage has been rejected by an unscrupulous critic, Scholten, without the least authority, and in opposition to all other writers. See Hilgenfeld, 'Einl.' p. 559. The centurion speaks of himself as a Gentile, "without God in the world." With the following (verses 6-9) the parallel in Matt. viii. 8-10, agrees almost exactly. But St. Matthew adds certain words of warning to the Jews (Matt. viii. 11, 12), which St. Luke, having the case of the Gentiles more prominently in his mind, has not thought it necessary to recite. St. Luke also omits the words of Jesus to the centurion, and the fact that the cure took place when the words were spoken (Matt. viii. 13).

**7.** *neither thought, &c.*] Or, **I did not even think that I was worthy.** The centurion uses here a different word for "worthy;" he now speaks of his feelings, then of his state.

### 11–18. The Widow's Son at Nain.

**11.** *the day after.*] St. Luke here gives a note of time. Meyer, after Lachmann, adopts the reading of the Alexandrian, the Vatican, and other MSS of the highest authority, which may be rendered "shortly afterwards." The miracle which follows (verses 11-17) occurs in no other Gospel.

*he went.*] "**He was going.**"

*Nain.*] This place is not mentioned elsewhere in the Bible. Josephus mentions a

ciples went with him, and much people.

12 Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow: and much people of the city was with her.

13 And when the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not.

14 And he came and touched the [1]bier: and they that bare *him* stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.

15 And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he delivered him to his mother.

16 And there came a fear on all: and they glorified God, saying, That a great prophet is risen up among us; and, That God hath visited his people.

17 And this rumour of him went forth throughout all Judæa, and throughout all the region round about.

[1] Or, *coffin.*

---

village of the name East of Jordan, but this Nain must have been in Galilee, or on its borders. Jerome and Eusebius say that it was in the neighbourhood of M. Tabor. Robinson identifies it with a small village, named Nein, at the foot of the lesser Hermon. According to Stanley ('Sinai and Palestine,' ch. x.) it is at two or three hours' distance from Nazareth. "One entrance alone it could have had, that which opens on the rough hill-side in its downward slope to the plain. It must have been in this steep descent, as, according to Eastern custom, they 'carried out the dead man;' that 'nigh to the gate' of the village the bier was stopped, and the long procession of mourners stayed, and 'the young man delivered back' to his mother" (*Ib.* ch. ix.). It is argued from verse 17 that the place must have been at least in the immediate neighbourhood of Judæa. Meyer and Bleek attempt to remove the difficulty by giving to Judæa, in that place, the sense of the whole of Palestine, a meaning which it is never known to bear. Godet, with greater probability, understands the Evangelist to mean that the fame of this miracle, having filled the whole of Galilee, was also spread throughout Judæa.

*much people.*] "**A great multitude,**" or crowd. So in the next verse.

12. *there was a dead man carried out.*] Rather "**One dead was being carried out.**" The places of sepulture were outside the towns, to avoid ceremonial pollution.

13. *had compassion.*] The peculiar sadness of the widow's position touched the Saviour's heart. St. Luke here displays His motive. It was not to exhibit His Divine power, or to attest His mission, but to do good. He comforts her by His word, in anticipation of His work of mercy.

14. *the bier.*] His manner and action arrest the attention of the bearers, and they stand still, waiting to see what will follow.

*Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.*] The pronoun "thee" is emphatic: compare and see on ch. v. 24; viii. 54. De Wette says "a formula of conjuration; a theurgic word of might;" Oosterzee "a word of command from the Prince of life," which is better, more reverent, and more true. "The supporters of natural interpretation pretend that the young man was merely overtaken by a lethargic sleep. In that case the miracle of power would only disappear to make room for a miracle of knowledge equally difficult to understand. For how should Jesus know that the supposed dead man was still alive, and that the moment of his awakening was at hand?" (Godet.)

15. *he delivered.*] Closely connected with what is said above (verse 13), "He had compassion on her." Compare 1 Kings xvii. 23; 2 Kings iv. 36.

16. *a fear.*] Because the power of God had been so signally manifested among them, or because, as they express it, "God had visited His people." Compare ch. i. 65, 68; v. 8.

17. *Judæa.*] See on verse 11. This is closely connected with what follows. It is evident that the miracle of Nain, as being a greater marvel of power than any which Jesus had previously exhibited, raised His fame to the highest pitch. His name was spread abroad not only in the immediate neighbourhood of the town in which the miracle was wrought, but throughout Judæa also. It was upon this that news of our Lord's wonder-working power reached the Baptist in his prison. St. Matthew (xi. 2) says that he had heard of "the works of Christ:" St. Luke tells us here which miracle it was which excited the greatest attention. See Hilgenfeld *l.c.* p. 560. The same critic who rejects verses 35-7, would expunge verses 16, 17, thus bearing witness to their importance.

[a] Matt. 11. 2.

18 [a]And the disciples of John shewed him of all these things.

19 ¶ And John calling *unto him* two of his disciples sent *them* to Jesus, saying, Art thou he that should come? or look we for another?

20 When the men were come unto him, they said, John Baptist hath sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that should come? or look we for another?

21 And in that same hour he cured many of *their* infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits; and unto many *that were* blind he gave sight.

22 Then Jesus answering said unto them, Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached.

23 And blessed is *he*, whosoever shall not be offended in me.

24 ¶ And when the messengers of John were departed, he began to speak unto the people concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness for to see? A reed shaken with the wind?

25 But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they which are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately, are in kings' courts.

26 But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet.

27 This is *he*, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

28 For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John

---

18–35. THE MESSENGERS OF JOHN BAPTIST.

**19.** *calling unto him two.*] Or, "**Having called unto him certain two.**" The account of the Baptist's message to Jesus, of our Saviour's reply, and of His remarks upon the Baptist and on the people's reception of him, are given altogether as in Matthew xi. 2-19 (where see notes), with the exception of certain omissions and additions which will be noticed as they severally occur. There is, however, a difference between the manner in which the incident and the conversation which ensued, are introduced by each Evangelist. St. Luke, as we have seen, places it immediately after the raising of the widow's son (with which he even connects it in the way of cause and effect) and makes that event occur very soon, and probably the very day, after the healing of the centurion's servant. This, too, in Luke (as in Matthew) follows the Sermon on the Mount (assuming that these Evangelists give us two reports of the same discourse), and that, in Luke, follows the appointment of the Apostles. St. Matthew (who records the Sermon in an earlier place) places the message of the Baptist next after the appointment of the Apostles, and the charge given to them in Matt. x.

**20.** *When the men.*] The delivery of the message, given in this verse, and the fact that Jesus was occupied at the time in doing works of mercy (explaining that which immediately follows) mentioned in verse 21, are passed over by St. Matthew, who as usual gives a brief recital of events, to dwell at greater length on the very words of Christ.

**24.** *were departed.*] Matthew (xi. 7) says, "as they departed:" but the difference is scarcely worthy of notice. The messengers of John had left the presence of Jesus, and were (as the words of St. Matthew literally mean) on their way.

**25.** *they which are gorgeously, &c.*] Literally, "**They which are in gorgeous apparel and in luxury.**" The form of expression is peculiar to St. Luke, who varies it in order to avoid repetition.

**26.** *much more.*] Or, "**One more remarkable.**" St. Matthew uses exactly the same expression, though different in our Version.

**28.** *a greater prophet.*] In the parallel, Matt. xi. 11, it is simply "a greater;" and here also it is doubtful whether "prophet" ought to appear in the text. It is omitted by the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS and in a great number of MSS and ancient versions. It is found in the Alexandrian MS. It is rejected by Lachmann, Westcott, and Hort, and marked as doubtful by Tregelles. It is not unlikely to be a gloss, explaining and limiting the use of "greater," *i. e.* as a prophet.

the Baptist: but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.

29 And all the people that heard *him*, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John.

30 But the Pharisees and lawyers [1]rejected the counsel of God [1]against themselves, being not baptized of him.

[1] Or, *frustrated*.
[1] Or, *within themselves*.
[b] Matt. 11. 16.

31 ¶ And the Lord said, [b]Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like?

32 They are like unto children sitting in the marketplace, and calling one to another, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept.

33 For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil.

34 The Son of man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!

35 But wisdom is justified of all her children.

36 ¶ [c]And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with

[c] Mark 14. 3.

---

*that is least.*] Rather, **he that is less**, *i.e.* inferior to John, in gifts and power, yet being "in the kingdom" is in a higher state.

**29.** *that heard him.*] Or, "**When they had heard**" him. St. Luke now omits the part of our Lord's discourse which appears in Matt. xi. 12-15. He inserts on the other hand a statement of the manner in which the Baptist was received (verses 29, 30), tending to explain and account for our Lord's words which follow (verses 31-35). The question arises whether this is to be regarded as a portion of our Lord's discourse, or whether it is a parenthetical insertion of the historian, by way of introduction to the words of Jesus which follow. If indeed the words which appear at the beginning of verse 31 ("And the Lord said") were certainly genuine, we could not hesitate to accept the latter alternative. But they are absent from all the most important MSS and are generally rejected by modern editors. They were perhaps inserted to shew that verses 29, 30 do not form part of the speech. We must therefore judge the question without reference to those words. If we compare this passage with that which occupies the corresponding position in St. Matthew's narrative (Matt. xi. 12), we shall probably agree with Meyer and other critics in this conclusion that it is intended to appear as a part of our Saviour's speech, of which St. Matthew only gives (in the verse referred to) a very brief summary, and which serves as an introduction to that which follows.

*justified God.*] Practically declared that they believed God to be right, in sending such a messenger.

**30.** *rejected the counsel.*] Or, "**Brought to nought the design of God with regard to themselves.**"

**31.** *And the Lord said.*] See on verse 29. The following passage (verses 31-35) is almost exactly as in Matt. xi. 16-19, except that St. Luke's report is somewhat more full of detail (see notes on Matt. xi. 16-19).

36-50. OUR LORD'S FEET ANOINTED BY A WOMAN WHICH WAS A SINNER.

**36.** *And one of the Pharisees.*] This narrative (verses 36-50) closely resembles one which appears in Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9; and John xii. 1-8. That, however, belongs to a much later period of our Saviour's ministry, and the question is whether it records a different event from that of which we read in the text, or whether St. Luke has antedated it. On the question of identity or difference see note on Matt. xxvi. 6. In this case we should bear in mind St. Luke's constant habit of omitting accounts of transactions which are similar in character. Having related this in its right place, he does not record the second anointing at Bethany.

Our proper course will be to treat the narrative before us independently. This Pharisee bore, as appears from verse 40, the name of Simon (*i.e.* Simeon, a very common name among the Jews of that day: in the forms Simeon and Simon, we have no less than seven mentioned in the New Testament). It is evident that he had been brought in some way under our Lord's influence, and the history which follows, and especially the parable which that history embodies, seem to prove that he had received, and ought at least to have been conscious of having received, some spiritual benefit from Him. The invitation given by one of the Pharisees to Jesus, points to an early period of His ministry. Later on, it would have been impossible for Simon to have acted thus without censure. The scene which follows is so wholly alien from

him. And he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat.

37 And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that *Jesus* sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment,

38 And stood at his feet behind *him* weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe *them* with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed *them* with the ointment.

39 Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him saw *it*, he spake within himself, saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman *this is* that toucheth him: for she is a sinner.

40 And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on.

41 There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one

---

our manners and way of life, that it is necessary to remind the reader that an Eastern house is open at the hours of meals, so that it is not uncommon (even now) for strangers to enter and to take part in conversation with the guests at table. (See Trench on the Parables: xvi.) The woman, who is not named, is described as "a sinner:" although nothing more is said, it is evident from verse 39 that she was notoriously a person of abandoned character: no supposition short of that will satisfy the requirements of the narrative; and the best supported reading in verse 37 would make it even more certain. We must also recollect, in order to understand the scene which is here described, that the guests lay on couches with their heads turned towards the table in the centre, their feet being turned away from the table, and towards the outer part of the room, where servants waited. The sandals would be laid aside, and the feet of each guest would be bare. The woman would therefore be able to approach unseen, to stand at the feet of Jesus "behind Him" (verse 38), and to anoint them while He was engaged in conversation with His entertainer. The identification of this woman with Mary Magdalene, assumed in the heading of the chapter, and supported by many Fathers, rests on no solid grounds.

*sat.*] Literally "lay."

37. *And, behold.*] Or, "And, behold, a woman which was in the city a sinner." See on verse 36. The MSS vary, but the reading of the A. V. has less authority.

*when she knew.*] It does not appear how she became aware of our Lord's presence in the house of Simon, or what her previous knowledge of Him had been. We may probably say, with Meyer, that she had been brought by the teaching of Jesus to repentance, faith, and a moral change, most likely by merely hearing Him: in a word, she had been converted, and was conscious that He had been the means of the change which had taken place in her (see verse 42). So also Godet.

*alabaster box.*] Compare and see on Matt. xxvi. 7.

39. *if he were a prophet.*] Public opinion had already marked out Jesus as a prophet, *i.e.* as a special messenger of God, armed with extraordinary powers. The reality of His prophetic mission was just the question on which we may suppose the mind of Simon to have been in a state of suspense; since, on the one hand, he belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, whose tendency and disposition were conservative, and who would therefore be disposed to reject with scorn any new claim to a supernatural mission; while on the other hand, the invitation which he gave to Jesus seems to shew that he was not unwilling to give Him a hearing. Here then, was a crucial test. If Jesus were indeed a prophet, if He were really endowed with extraordinary powers and insight, He must have known the character of so notorious a sinner as the woman who stood behind Him: and if He did know it, then, Simon thought, He must, if He were truly sent from God, have recoiled at her touch. Jesus answers the unspoken objection of Simon, by shewing His power of reading the heart, as well as by proving to Him that the woman, gross sinner though she had been, was now forgiven and accepted, though the Pharisee did not know it. The parable which follows, peculiar to St. Luke, is altogether different in its moral, as well as in its details, from that in Matt. xviii. 23-35 (where see notes), although the machinery made use of is similar. In that case the two debts are enormously different, the second bearing no sort of proportion to the first. They represent the offences of man against God, and of man against man, respectively. Here, though there is a great difference, the disproportion is not so enormous as in the other case; since they both represent the offences of man against

owed five hundred [l]pence, and the other fifty.

[l] See Matt. 18. 28.

42 And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most?

43 Simon answered and said, I suppose that *he*, to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged.

44 And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped *them* with the hairs of her head.

45 Thou gavest me no kiss: but this woman since the time I came in hath not ceased to kiss my feet.

46 My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment.

47 Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, *the same* loveth little.

---

God. For the interpretation of the Parable see note on verse 47.

**41.** *five hundred.*] About £15 12*s.* 6*d.* and £1 11*s.* 3*d.* of our money, respectively.

**44.** *turned.*] She stood behind Him, verse 38: see on verse 36.

*water for my feet.*] Literally "**Water upon my feet**," according to custom. Compare Gen. xviii. 4; Judg. xix. 21; 1 Tim. v. 10. The feet had no covering but sandals, which were put off at meal times, and the feet of a wayfarer were necessarily soiled with dust. Compare also John xiii. 10.

*the hairs of her head.*] A climax: her long hair was "a glory unto her:" 1 Cor. xi. 15: and the hairs *of her head* are so described for the sake of a stronger antithesis.

**45.** *kiss.*] Also required by custom: Exod. xviii. 7. There is here, also, an antithesis between the ordinary kiss, neglected by Simon, and kissing *the feet.*

*since the time I came in.*] The reading of a single uncial MS, of several cursives and ancient versions, "since the time she came in," is almost certainly a correction, made on the supposition that the woman had entered the house after the guests had sat down (verse 37). But, as De Wette points out, she may probably have come in with Jesus.

**46.** *My head with oil.*] There is a double opposition here. The ointment was more precious and costly with oil; and the feet a less dignified part of the body than the head.

**47.** *Wherefore I say.*] The moral of the Parable, and indeed of the entire narrative, lies in this verse. Certain points in the interpretation of the Parable lie on the surface. The creditor is God Himself: the two debtors are sinners, and they are both forgiven. Their love towards their benefactor is represented as springing out of their gratitude for His forgiveness. It is evident, so far, that our Lord teaches that the love of God is the result and not the antecedent cause of the forgiveness of sins; in other words, that "We love Him, because He first loved us" (1 John iv. 19). And in verse 50 our Saviour distinctly tells the woman that her faith (not her love) hath saved her. Two difficulties, however, arise at this point. First, how are we to reconcile with this interpretation of the Parable the former clause of verse 47? and, secondly, are we to understand that the love of God is in exact proportion to the gravity of the sins forgiven? (1.) The answer to the first question turns partly on the precise meaning of the words "Wherefore I say," &c., but the consideration of this question must also help us to determine their meaning. Thus, so far as mere grammatical considerations are concerned, "wherefore" may be connected either with "I say unto thee," or with "her sins are forgiven;" and "for" may be used either in a logical or in a causal sense. Reading the clause in the light of the Parable, and of the second member of the verse ("but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little"), we can have no hesitation in accepting the former alternative in each case (with Bengel, Meyer, Trench, Godet, and others, against Roman Catholic expositors, De Wette, &c.). "This being the case, I declare unto thee that her sins,—those many sins with which thou upbraidest her,—have already been forgiven, as may be seen from the fact that she loveth much: whereas he to whom little is forgiven loveth little." (2.) To suppose that the love of God is proportionate to the magnitude of sins forgiven would be to press the details of the Parable too far, and would also be shocking to our natural religious instinct. What our Saviour meant to teach was that the love which man bears towards God is in proportion to *his sense* of God's forgiveness.

48 And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven.

49 And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also?

50 And he said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.

## CHAPTER VIII.

3 *Women minister unto Christ of their substance.* 4 *Christ, after he had preached from place to place, attended with his apostles, propoundeth the parable of the sower,* 16 *and of the candle:* 21 *declareth who are his mother, and brethren:* 22 *rebuketh the winds:* 26 *casteth the legion of devils out of the man into the herd of swine:* 37 *is rejected of the Gadarenes:* 43 *healeth the woman of her bloody issue,* 49 *and raiseth from death Jairus' daughter.*

AND it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and shewing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God: and the twelve *were* with him,

2 And certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, [a] out of whom went seven devils,

[a] Mark 16. 9.

3 And Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto him of their substance.

4 ¶ [b] And when much people were gathered together, and were come to him out of every city, he spake by a parable:

[b] Matt. 13. 2.

5 A sower went out to sow his

---

48. *Thy sins are forgiven.*] "Bleek has concluded . . . that this woman did not possess her pardon until this moment. This supposition is excluded by all that goes before. Bleek forgets that ἀφέωνται denotes a condition resulting from an action completed at an indeterminate time" (Godet). Our Lord gives, what the conscience of the sinner needed, an assurance of the forgiveness, which had been virtually secured by her faith.

49. *forgiveth sins also.*] Or "**Even forgiveth sins.**" Compare ch. v. 21.

50. *And he said.*] Our Lord does not notice the cavil of the other guests; or rather He practically answers them by continuing His speech to the woman. The expression made use of by Him is used by Him elsewhere (ch. viii. 48) with reference to the cure of a bodily infirmity: here it is used of spiritual healing (De Wette).

CHAP. VIII. 1. *afterward.*] Properly "**During the time which followed.**"

*went throughout.*] Or "**Kept journeying through.**" The tense marks continued practice. The Evangelist here calls our attention to a change in our Lord's manner of life. No longer making Capernaum His basis of operations, He commenced a life of wandering through the towns and villages of Galilee. The women who are mentioned in verses 2, 3 (compare and see note on ch. xxiii. 55) are here introduced, in order to shew how His wants and those of His company were now provided for (Godet).

2. *Mary called Magdalene.*] See note on Matt. xxvii. 56.

*seven devils.*] See the note on Mark xvi. 9.

3. *Joanna the wife of Chuza.*] Chuza seems to have been at the head of Herod's household. By Herod we are to understand Antipas, as the scene of this circuit, and of Joanna's ministrations, was Galilee. Nothing however is known, except from this place, either of Joanna or of Susanna who is mentioned with her.

*ministered unto him.*] Some MSS have "ministered unto them," *i.e.* to Jesus and the Twelve: but the authorities are nearly balanced. Compare Matt. xxvii. 55, 56. "What a Messiah, to the eyes of the flesh, was this One who lived on the bounty of men. But what a Messiah, to the eyes of the spirit, was this Son of God, living by the love of those whom His love had made to live!" (Godet.)

4–15. THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER.

4. *And when much people.*] Rather, "**And while a great multitude were gathering together and men of every city were coming unto him.**" So the Vulg., Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, Godet. The passage might be translated "And while a great multitude even of those who came to Him out of every city was being gathered together" (Kuinöl, Meyer), but the construction is forced and improbable. The Parable of the Sower (verses 5-15) also occurs in Matt. xiii. 3. The order of events is clearest in St. Mark; see note on Mark iv. 1. In St. Matthew's Gospel, the Parable stands at the head of the great group of similitudes, commonly known as the Parables of the Kingdom: in St. Mark it is followed by two

seed: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side; and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air devoured it.

6 And some fell upon a rock; and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it lacked moisture.

7 And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprang up with it, and choked it.

8 And other fell on good ground, and sprang up, and bare fruit an hundredfold. And when he had said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

9 And his disciples asked him, saying, What might this parable be?

10 And he said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand.

11 [c] Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God.

[c] Matt. 13. 18.

12 Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved.

---

others, one of which is found nowhere else: in St. Luke's account it is wholly isolated. Of the other six "Parables of the Kingdom," two only occur in this Gospel (ch. xiii. 18-21).

*by a parable.*] St. Matthew says "in parables": St. Luke gives only one. Sparingness in recital is characteristic of this Gospel.

5. *and it was trodden down.*] This part of the similitude is found only in St. Luke. De Wette objects to it as unsuitable, since we are rather to think of the road as already trodden hard, so that the seed gets no covering of earth. Meyer answers, that it is not unsuitable to the general picture, although it is not to be pressed in the interpretation. The fact is, that it comes in, as it were, *ex abundanti:* the seed gets no covering or shelter, so that it is exposed to every kind of external injury, whether from birds or from the feet of wayfarers.

6. *upon a rock.*] Or "**upon the rock,**" answering to the "stony (*i.e.* shallow rocky) ground" of Matthew and Mark. The springing up of the seed is distinctly stated in the parallel passages, and is rather implied in this ("*when* it was sprung up").

*because it lacked moisture.*] Added by St. Luke. In the parallel passages the rising of the sun in the heavens is made part of the picture, and the heat of the sun is interpreted to mean persecution for religion. St. Luke omits this part of the parable itself, but preserves a trace of it in the interpretation (verse 13).

7. *among thorns.*] "**In the midst of the thorns.**" The expression is peculiar to St. Luke, and is stronger than those which occur in the parallels. And St. Luke alone says that the thorns "sprang up *with*" the seed.

8. *an hundredfold.*] SS. Matthew and Mark speak of various degrees of fruitfulness: St. Luke only mentions the highest degree.

*He that hath.*] Compare Matt. xiii. 9; Mark iv. 9.

9. *his disciples asked him.*] Literally "were asking." The question as given by St. Matthew has a more general form. "Why speakest thou unto them in parables?" (Matt. xiii. 10.) St. Mark, without giving the words of the question, makes it refer (as here) to the parable just delivered (Mark iv. 19). The first clause of the answer, as reported by St. Luke (verse 10), contains the substance of the answer to the general question "why speakest thou unto them in parables?" though the question itself does not appear in this place. The answer is given much more fully by the other Evangelists, especially the first (Matt. xiii. 11-17; Mark iv. 11, 12).

11. *The seed is the word of God.*] This is implied, but not directly expressed, in Matt. xiii. 19. The language of Mark iv. 14, approaches more nearly to the text.

12. *Those by the way side.*] *I.e.* "They which are sown by the way side." So Meyer and Godet, against De Wette. The seed properly represents the word, but is here applied to those who receive it. (So in verse 13, "They on the rock.") Again the language of St. Mark and St. Luke approaches most nearly to each other: but the latter is more condensed than either of the parallels.

*they that hear.*] St. Matthew (xiii. 19) adds "and understandeth it not." Therefore, it is argued that by "they that hear" is meant "They that *hear* and nothing more." (De Wette, Godet.) This explanation is unnecessary. The stress of the sentence rests on the "then" which follows. "As soon as they have heard, the devil comes," &c.

*lest they should believe and be saved.*] Peculiar to St. Luke.

13 They on the rock *are they*, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away.

14 And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of *this* life, and bring no fruit to perfection.

15 But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep *it*, and bring forth fruit with patience.

16 ¶ [d] No man, when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth *it* under a bed; but setteth *it* on a candlestick, that they which enter in may see the light.

17 [e] For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest; neither *any thing* hid, that shall not be known and come abroad.

18 Take heed therefore how ye hear: [f] for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he [1] seemeth to have.

[d] Matt. 5. 15.

[e] Matt. 10. 26.

[f] Matt. 13. 12.

[1] Or, *thinketh that he hath.*

---

**14.** *go forth.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. The clause is variously rendered: but our version follows the rendering of the Vulgate, which is adopted by De Wette, Bleek, Godet, Oosterzee. No doubt this is the true translation. The phrase "go forth" is, as De Wette terms it, "a picturesque addition," but it is much more: it marks the transition from hearing and learning to active life, and the dangers which religious principles encounter when they are subjected to the rough test of practice.

**15.** *in an honest and good heart.*] This also is peculiar to St. Luke. He seems to explain the meaning of the expression made use of in the parallel passage of St. Matthew, (Matt. xiii. 23) and (by consequence) that which occurs in Matt. xiii. 19: "He that heareth the word, and understandeth it" . . . "heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not." There must be in the heart already something responsive to God's message, in order that it may germinate and fructify.

*keep it ... with patience.*] These expressions also are found in St. Luke alone. They urge the need of perseverance, in opposition to the various temptations to fall away which have just been described. Godet compares Rom. ii. 7.

16–18. PROVERBIAL SAYINGS IN CONNEXION WITH THE FOREGOING EXPOSITION.

**16.** *No man.*] The short application which follows (verses 16-18) consists of expressions which, in Matthew, appear in different positions. Verse 16 appears in Matt. v. 15 as part of the Sermon on the Mount, where it is not out of place. Verse 17 is found in Matt. x. 26 in a wholly different connexion. And the latter part of verse 18 is found in Matt. xiii. 12 in the discourse which intervenes between the Parable of the Sower and its interpretation. St. Mark, on the other hand, has the substance of these three verses in the same position in which they are found in St. Luke (Mark iv. 21-25), the substance of verse 18 being given somewhat more fully than by St. Luke. De Wette says that the recurrence of these expressions in a somewhat different shape in other places is to be explained by the fact that they were circulated by oral tradition in a detached form. This is, of course, very possible in certain cases; but it is also certain that our Lord repeated His sayings, and it seems clear that they were also made use of by Him in somewhat different connexions. It is to be observed that some of the phrases which appear here, are repeated even by the same Evangelists. Thus verse 16 recurs in ch. xi. 33; verse 17 occurs in ch. xii. 2, and the proverbial expression in verse 18, appears ch. xix. 26, as well as in Matt. xiii. 12, and xxv. 29. So Meyer and Oosterzee. The connexion of this paragraph with that which precedes it, is at first sight obscure, but is (as De Wette shews) explained by verse 18. In fact, the first words of that verse "Take heed therefore how ye hear," give the key-note both of this paragraph and of the foregoing parable, and bind the whole together in one. On the meaning of the whole passage, see notes on Mark. iv. 21-25.

*a bed.*] Rather, "**a couch.**"

**17.** *come abroad.*] Or "**Come to light.**"

**18.** *that which he seemeth to have.*] Or "**That which he thinketh he hath.**" This expression is peculiar to St. Luke. In the parallel and similar passages (even in ch. xix. 26) it is "that which he hath." De Wette explains it of the uncertainty of the possession; Meyer of the mistaken imagination

[g] Matt. 12. 46.

19 ¶ [g] Then came to him *his* mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press.

20 And it was told him *by certain* which said, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee.

21 And he answered and said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it.

[h] Matt. 8. 23.

22 ¶ [h] Now it came to pass on a certain day, that he went into a ship with his disciples: and he said unto them, Let us go over unto the other side of the lake. And they launched forth.

23 But as they sailed he fell asleep: and there came down a storm of wind on the lake; and they were filled *with water*, and were in jeopardy.

24 And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, Master, master, we perish. Then he arose, and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water: and they ceased, and there was a calm.

25 And he said unto them, Where is your faith? And they being afraid wondered, saying one to another, What manner of man is this! for he commandeth even the winds and water, and they obey him.

26 ¶ [i] And they arrived at the

[i] Matt. 8. 28.

---

of the person who supposes that the possession is his own. Godet points out that the "thinketh he hath" of St. Luke really comes to the same thing with the "hath" of Mark iv. 25 (the only real parallel). That which has been heard, but is not understood (in the high sense of Matt. xiii. 19) may be said in one sense to be in the possession, and in another sense not to be in the possession, of the hearer. "He seemeth to have, who doth not use." (Bengel.)

**19.** *Then came.*] Or, **but there came.** This (verses 19-21) appears more fully in Matt. xii. 46-50, and Mark iii. 31-35 (where see notes). In each of those places it immediately precedes (instead of, as here, immediately following) the delivery of the Parable of the Sower.

*the press.*] Or "**the multitude.**"

**21.** *hear the word of God, and do it.*] Substantially the same with the parallel expressions in Matt. xii. 50 and Mark iii. 33-35. But the words, as reported by St. Luke, seem to have acquired a new turn from the Parable of the Sower which they follow. St. Luke alone speaks here of "hearing the word of God:" compare verses 12, 15, 18.

### The Voyage to the Country of the Gadarenes.

**22.** *Now it came to pass.*] The same account (verses 22-25) appears in Matt. viii. 23-27, and more fully in Mark iv. 35-41. In St. Matthew's narrative it follows the healing of the centurion's servant, and Peter's wife's mother (the conversations recorded ch. ix. 57-60, coming in between): St. Mark places it directly after the "Parables of the Kingdom," or so many of them as he recites. St. Matthew introduces it without a note of time; the reference to time which St. Luke gives is extremely vague; whereas St. Mark (who gives this account, as usual, with much precision with respect both to place and time) says distinctly that it belongs to the evening of the day on which the parables which he recites were delivered (Mark iv. 35). With this the order of St. Luke agrees.

*Let us go over.*] Compare and see note on Matt. viii. 18.

**23.** *they were filled.*] Or "**they were filling.**"

**24.** *Master, master.*] The repetition, peculiar to St. Luke, marks anxiety.

**26.** *And they arrived.*] That which follows (verses 26-39) is also found in the same position in Matt. viii. 28-34; Mark v. 1-20; where see notes. The account of St. Matthew enters much less into detail. He does not mention with the same particularity with the other two Evangelists the savage condition of the demoniac, but contents himself with saying that he was "exceeding fierce;" he omits all mention of our Lord's question, and of the name of Legion given in reply (Mark v. 9; verse 30); and he tells us nothing about the condition of the man after his cure, or of our Lord's advice to him (Mark v. 15, 18-20; verses 35, 36, 38, 39). On these points, as on one which will now be mentioned, there is close agreement between St. Mark and St. Luke. St. Matthew speaks of two demoniacs; the other Evangelists of one only. With regard to this difficulty see note on Matt. viii. 28.

*they arrived.*] Properly "**they sailed in.**"

country of the Gadarenes, which is over against Galilee.

27 And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in *any* house, but in the tombs.

28 When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, *thou* Son of God most high? I beseech thee, torment me not.

29 (For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. For oftentimes it had caught him: and he was kept bound with chains and in fetters; and he brake the bands, and was driven of the devil into the wilderness.)

30 And Jesus asked him, saying, What is thy name? And he said, Legion: because many devils were entered into him.

31 And they besought him that he would not command them to go out into the deep.

32 And there was there an herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they besought him that he would suffer them to enter into them. And he suffered them.

33 Then went the devils out of the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the lake, and were choked.

34 When they that fed *them* saw what was done, they fled, and went and told *it* in the city and in the country.

35 Then they went out to see what was done; and came to Jesus, and found the man, out of whom the devils were departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid.

36 They also which saw *it* told them by what means he that was possessed of the devils was healed.

37 ¶ Then the whole multitude of the country of the Gadarenes round about besought him to depart from them; for they were taken with great fear: and he went up into the ship, and returned back again.

---

*the Gadarenes.*] Or, as we are perhaps to read, "**the Gerasenes.**" As to the reading see notes on Matt. viii. 28, and Mark v. 1. St. Luke alone explains, for the benefit of his Gentile readers, that the country spoken of is "over against Galilee." Such geographical notices are rare in this Evangelist. In this passage it has special importance, as shewing the accuracy of St. Mark's narrative, touching the place where the parables were delivered. See Resch, Jahrb. D. T. 1876, p. 664.

**27.** *there met him out of the city a certain man.*] Rather "**there met him a certain man of the city.**" So Kuinöl, Meyer, and De Wette, who points out that the demoniac lived among the tombs.

*devils.*] Mark says "an unclean spirit."

**29.** *For he had commanded.*] The exclamation of the demoniac is elicited by the urgent command of Jesus, which is accounted for by the detailed description of the symptoms in the remainder of this verse. The weight of MS authority is, however, in favour of another reading, "**He was, or continued, commanding;**" the tense expressing the urgency and persistency with which the command was given.

*oftentimes.*] Rather, "**for a long time.**"

**31.** *go out into the deep.*] St. Matthew mentions the second request (verse 32) of the unclean spirits, but passes this over. St. Mark gives it in a different form. "He besought him much that He would not send them away out of the country" (compare and see on Mark v. 10). For this we have here a peculiar phrase, which is illustrated by the use of the same word in Rev. ix. 1; xx. 3, where it is translated "the bottomless pit," and where it stands for the under-world, in which evil spirits are confined. On the whole subject see notes on the parallel passages.

**33.** *down a steep place.*] "**Down the steep.**"

**36.** *was healed.*] Properly, "**was saved,**" in the sense in which the word (*here* peculiar to Luke) is used.

**37.** *Then the whole.*] "**And the whole multitude of the surrounding country**

38 Now the man out of whom the devils were departed besought him that he might be with him: but Jesus sent him away, saying,

39 Return to thine own house, and shew how great things God hath done unto thee. And he went his way, and published throughout the whole city how great things Jesus had done unto him.

40 And it came to pass, that, when Jesus was returned, the people *gladly* received him: for they were all waiting for him.

41 ¶ [a] And, behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him that he would come into his house:

[a] Matt. 9. 18.

42 For he had one only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went the people thronged him.

43 ¶ And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, which had spent all her living upon physicians, neither could be healed of any,

44 Came behind *him*, and touched

---

**of the Gerasenes besought him."** Compare and see note on verse 26. The expression is obviously hyperbolical. So Matt. viii. 34; Mark says simply, "they besought him."

**38.** *Now the man.*] Compare and see note on Mark v. 18.

*sent him away.*] Literally, "**dismissed him.**" Mark says "suffered him not."

**39.** *throughout the whole city.*] Mark says more (verse 20), "He departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him." St. Luke, as usual, omits the geographical detail, which would have required explanation.

40–56. THE RETURN TO CAPERNAUM, AND MIRACLES WROUGHT THERE.

**40.** *when Jesus was returned.*] To Galilee, as appears from the parallel passages, Matt. ix. 1; Mark v. 21. St. Matthew adds that He "came into his own city,"—not Nazareth, but Capernaum for which He had previously quitted Nazareth (Matt. iv. 13). After His return to Capernaum St. Matthew mentions the cure of the paralytic, the calling of Matthew, and the discourse concerning fasting (related above, chapter v. 18-39, in the same order). Then follows the account of Jairus' daughter interrupted by that of the woman who had an issue of blood (Matt. ix. 18-26). These occurrences are said to have taken place immediately after the conversation concerning fasting "while He was yet speaking." In Mark, v. 22-43, these two miracles occupy the same position as in St. Luke. As in the case of the demoniac just related, St. Mark's account of these two miracles is the fullest; that of St. Matthew the most condensed, of the three Gospels. Compare with the following narrative (verses 41-56), and see notes on the parallel passages just referred to.

*received him.*] The Authorised Version gives the true meaning by inserting "gladly;" they welcomed Him back again. St. Mark says that "much people gathered unto him," and adds that "he was nigh unto the sea."

**41.** *Jairus.*] In Hebrew, Jair; compare Judg. x. 3. The name is given only by SS. Mark and Luke: the former calls him "one of the rulers of the synagogue;" Matthew "a ruler." Matthew and Mark give the words of Jairus, the latter more fully; Luke merely gives their substance. In Matthew's account, the daughter is just dead, and the father expresses his belief in the power of Jesus to raise her to life; in Mark she is *in extremis*; in Luke it is said that she was dying when Jairus came. Matthew relates the history, "here as elsewhere, summarily; he unites in one single message the arrival of the father, and that of the messenger, who comes afterwards to announce the death" (Godet). Compare and see note on ch. vii. 1. Mark and Luke give the age of the girl, which is not mentioned by Matthew, and Luke adds that she was an only child (compare ch. vii. 12).

**43.** *And a woman.*] "**And a woman having had an issue of blood twelve years, who had moreover**" (*i.e.* in addition to her malady) "**spent all her living upon physicians and yet could not be healed by any one.**" St. Matthew omits the mention of ineffectual attempts to cure the sufferer. St. Mark, on the other hand (v. 26), states this point even more strongly. Hence, some ingenious critics have argued that Luke has softened down this part of the narrative, from professional sensitiveness! At all events, he puts the matter strongly enough to be accepted as an honest witness.

the border of his garment: and immediately her issue of blood stanched.

45 And Jesus said, Who touched me? When all denied, Peter and they that were with him said, Master, the multitude throng thee and press *thee*, and sayest thou, Who touched me?

46 And Jesus said, Somebody hath touched me: for I perceive that virtue is gone out of me.

47 And when the woman saw that she was not hid, she came trembling, and falling down before him, she declared unto him before all the people for what cause she had touched him, and how she was healed immediately.

48 And he said unto her, Daughter, be of good comfort: thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace.

49 ¶ While he yet spake, there cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue's *house*, saying to him, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master.

50 But when Jesus heard *it*, he answered him, saying, Fear not: believe only, and she shall be made whole.

51 And when he came into the house, he suffered no man to go in,

---

**44.** *the border.*] Or "**the fringe.**" See note on Matt. ix. 20, where the same word in the original is rendered "the hem." Mark simply has His garment. Matthew and Mark give the woman's intention in the dramatic form of a soliloquy; and Matthew does not state that the cure was effected immediately upon her touching the garment. If, indeed, we took his words alone, we should rather have inferred that it took place upon the utterance of the short speech recorded here (verse 48). Mark and Luke, as usual, agree closely throughout.

**45.** *And Jesus said.*] All the conversation which follows (verses 45-47) disappears from St. Matthew's concise narrative.

*Peter and they that were with him.*] St. Peter is, as usual, the leader and spokesman of the Apostles. He is specially mentioned by St. Luke alone. He exhibits in this place his usual hastiness, assuming that the touch, of which our Lord was conscious, was nothing but the ordinary pressure of the crowd, and taking upon himself *almost* to rebuke Him (compare Matt. xvi. 22). Observe the patient dignity of the Lord's reply.

**46.** *virtue.*] Or "**power:**" compare and note on Mark v. 30. See also ch. vi. 19.

**48.** *thy faith.*] Compare ch. vii. 50. De Wette says that it is evident that these verses (45-48) are an interpolation into the simpler and more original narrative recorded by St. Matthew. He also finds in them several improbabilities, specifying, however, only one, namely, the explanation of His sensation made by our Lord in verse 46. But, first, the omission of these three verses would not restore St. Luke's narrative to a condition precisely similar to that of St. Matthew. There would still remain the sudden healing, immediately following the touch, which does not appear in St. Matthew's account (see on verse 44). Moreover, the special improbability which De Wette has singled out for notice, seems to mark the originality of this part of the narrative. It is such as would hardly be inserted by a later historian. It would be more likely to be omitted in the process of softening down. The strangeness of the incident would strike a thoughtful person in ancient as much as in modern times. Lastly, it may be questioned whether Matthew does not retain a vestige of this part of the narrative, which is now only found in Mark and Luke. In Matt. ix. 22, we read that "Jesus turned him about, and when he saw her he said, Daughter," &c. The action is the same as that described by Mark and Luke, and the expression "when He saw her" implies that our Lord turned round in search of the person who touched Him. The conversation, then, which is recorded by Mark and Luke, though not by Matthew, falls quite naturally into its place, consistently with the account of the Evangelist last mentioned.

**49.** *While he yet spake.*] This part of the history (verses 49-51) does not occur in St. Matthew, but is given by St. Mark in nearly the same words. St. Mark, as usual, is the most full of detail, and St. Matthew the least circumstantial. Luke condenses into one the two entries made by our Lord (and recorded by Mark separately): 1. with Peter, James, and John into the house of Jairus; and 2. with the three Apostles, and the father and mother, into the chamber of death. In like manner Matthew groups together in one the two messages received by our Lord, and mentioned separately by the two other Evangelists: 1, stating the dangerous condition of the child; and 2, bringing news of her actual decease.

save Peter, and James, and John, and the father and the mother of the maiden.

52 And all wept, and bewailed her: but he said, Weep not; she is not dead, but sleepeth.

53 And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead.

54 And he put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise.

55 And her spirit came again, and she arose straightway: and he commanded to give her meat.

56 And her parents were astonished: but he charged them that they should tell no man what was done.

## CHAPTER IX.

*1 Christ sendeth his apostles to work miracles, and to preach. 7 Herod desired to see Christ. 17 Christ feedeth five thousand: 18 enquireth what opinion the world had of him: foretelleth his passion: 23 proposeth to all the pattern of his patience. 28 The transfiguration. 37 He healeth the lunatick: 43 again forewarneth his disciples of his passion. 46 commendeth humility: 51 biddeth them to shew mildness towards all, without desire of revenge. 57 Divers would follow him, but upon conditions.*

THEN [b] he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.

[b] Matt. x. 1.

2 And he sent them to preach the

---

52. *And all wept.*] "**And they were all weeping and mourning for her;**" not in the chamber of death, but in the house (Meyer). This appears from a comparison of the text with Mark v. 40. Matthew also mentions the presence of minstrels, hired to attend the funeral. These all desired to follow Jesus to the chamber where the dead child lay, but (as the three Evangelists agree in telling us) "He put them all out."

53. *knowing that she was dead.*] This addition is peculiar to St. Luke. It makes it plain, if there can be any doubt on the point, that the girl was really dead. "Therefore they all ought to have acknowledged the miracle" (Bengel). Olshausen thinks it probable that she was merely in a deep trance, and practically speaks of the act as a miracle of knowledge rather than of power. By "knowing that she was dead," he understands that her friends had tried every means of saving or resuscitating her, and were therefore convinced that this was the case. This will not satisfy the requirements of this clause. As Godet shews, Luke would have used some less decided word than "knowing," if this thought had been in his mind. We must therefore interpret our Lord's words in the previous verse to mean, not that the maid was not really dead, but that with Him in whose hands are the issues of life and death, death is no death but merely a transient sleep out of which He can at will awaken His servants (compare the use of language misunderstood by the disciples in John xi. 11). The instinct of the apostolic, and of the later Church, has shrunk from applying the term "death" to the condition of the Christian after his removal from this world, and, after the example of Christ, and with the same great truth in view which is here taught by Him, the word "sleep" has been commonly substituted for it (see Acts vii. 60; 1 Thess. iv. 14).

54. *Maid, arise.*] The exact words, of which these are a translation, are given by St. Mark (compare and see note on Mark v. 41); no words are given by Matthew, but the three Evangelists describe the accompanying action.

55. *arose straightway.*] St. Mark adds "and walked."

*and he commanded.*] The charges to give the maid something to eat, and to keep the event secret, are found in Mark and Luke, not in Matthew. The former is especially worthy to be noticed. It shows that the miracle was no mere display of thaumaturgic power. As in the case of the widow's son (compare and see on ch. vii. 13–15), Jesus wrought the miracle, not to shew His power, but because He desired to do good. Again, if the historians had desired to make the miracle as surprising as possible, they might have been disposed to suppress rather than to record this fact; since it might naturally be thought that one who had the power to raise the dead to life, would have no need especially to prescribe the means of preserving life.

CHAP. IX.—1–9. MISSION OF THE APOSTLES AND THE EFFECT UPON HEROD.

1. *Then he called.*] This mission of the Twelve occurs in the same position in Mark vi. 7-13 (where see notes), except that the second rejection of Jesus by His countrymen at Nazareth comes in between. The records

kingdom of God, and to heal the sick.

3 And he said unto them, Take nothing for *your* journey, neither staves, nor scrip, neither bread, neither money; neither have two coats apiece.

4 And whatsoever house ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart.

5 And whosoever will not receive you, when ye go out of that city, shake off the very dust from your feet for a testimony against them.

6 And they departed, and went through the towns, preaching the gospel, and healing every where.

7 ¶ [c] Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done by him: and he was perplexed, because that it was said of some, that John was risen from the dead;

[c] Matt. 14. 1.

8 And of some, that Elias had appeared; and of others, that one of the old prophets was risen again.

9 And Herod said, John have I beheaded: but who is this, of whom I hear such things? And he desired to see him.

10 ¶ And the apostles, when they

---

of St. Mark and St. Luke agree very closely. St. Matthew, as usual, gives the discourse much more in detail (Matt. x.), but interposes two miracles between the raising of Jairus' daughter, and this charge to the Apostles, viz. the healing of two blind men, and the casting out of the dumb devil (Matt. ix. 27-35): much of the additional matter in St. Matthew's report, appears in the charge to the Seventy, given only by Luke (ch. xii.).

*his twelve disciples.*] We are probably to read with the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS "**the twelve**," the equivalent formula in the text having crept in from the parallel passage in St. Matthew. "The Twelve" is the expression regularly employed by St. Luke.

7. *Herod the tetrarch.*] Herod Antipas. See on ch. ii. 1. Both St. Mark and St. Luke mention this doubt and difficulty in the mind of Herod, and the various conjectures current about Jesus, immediately after the mission of the Twelve. This mission had no doubt the effect of spreading the fame of Jesus widely throughout Galilee. Compare and see notes on the parallel passage in Mark vi. 14-16; and see especially vi. 14. St. Mark, however, takes this opportunity of introducing (by way of explanation) the imprisonment (Mark vi. 17-20) and violent death (Mark vi. 21-29) of the Baptist, of which the former is mentioned, in anticipation, by St. Luke (ch. iii. 19, 20) while the latter is not related by him although in verse 9 it is referred to in his report of Herod's words. We find in St. Matthew also a very brief account of Herod hearing of the fame of Jesus, which is made the occasion of introducing the history of the Baptist's imprisonment and death. (Matt. xiv. 1-12.) There it immediately follows the delivery of the seven "Parables of the Kingdom." It can hardly be an accident, however, that Matthew *does* mention *something else* about John the Baptist (viz. his sending disciples to Jesus) immediately after the charge to the Twelve. (Matt. xi. 1-15.) It is easy to imagine that, if it was customary to recite from memory the leading facts of our Lord's history, and to follow an order preserved by the association of ideas, a kindred event might in some cases be substituted for that which occupied the same place in the original recital.

*of all that was done by him.*] Or as we ought probably to read, "**of all that was being done:**" *i.e.* not the works of Jesus alone, but the teaching and works of His Apostles; though, of course, the works of Jesus are chiefly referred to; this serves to connect what follows closely with the foregoing mission of the Twelve.

*said of some.*] By Herod himself, according to Mark vi. 14, 16, where see note. So it is in Matt. xiv. 1, where (however) the perplexity of Herod and the various theories concerning the person of Jesus do not appear.

8. *Elias.*] Compare and see note on ch. i. 17.

9. *have I beheaded.*] Rather "**I beheaded.**" Luke mentions the death of John only in this incidental way, a fact strangely overlooked by Renan, who asserts that St. Luke suppresses the account of the murder of John the Baptist by Antipas. See 'Les Évangiles,' p. 255.

*he desired to see him.*] This fact is not mentioned in either of the parallel passages. It is, however, repeated in ch. xxiii. 8, where the reason of Herod's wish also appears. This Evangelist only tells us that our Lord was sent by Pilate to Herod, before the crucifixion. (ch. xxiii. 6-12.)

### 10–17. Return of the Apostles and the Miracle of Feeding.

10. *And the apostles.*] The return of the Twelve from their circuits is mentioned in the

were returned, told him all that they had done. [d] And he took them, and went aside privately into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida.

[d] Matt. 14. 13.

11 And the people, when they knew *it*, followed him: and he received them, and spake unto them of the kingdom of God, and healed them that had need of healing.

12 [e] And when the day began to wear away, then came the twelve, and said unto him, Send the multitude away, that they may go into the towns and country round about, and lodge, and get victuals: for we are here in a desert place.

[e] Matt. 14. 15.

13 But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more but five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy meat for all this people.

14 For they were about five thousand men. And he said to his disciples, Make them sit down by fifties in a company.

15 And they did so, and made them all sit down.

16 Then he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them, and brake, and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude.

17 And they did eat, and were all

---

same connexion, Mark vi. 30. It is there as here, immediately followed by the retirement of Christ with His disciples into a desert place, and by the feeding of the five thousand. The retirement to the desert place, and the subsequent miracle, are also mentioned by Matthew directly after the account of Herod's hearing of Jesus, and not of the death of the Baptist, which there (as in Mark) comes in as an episode. Compare and see notes on Matt. xiv. 13-21; Mark vi. 30-44. Certain differences ought to be noticed at this point. St. Matthew appears to intimate that the retirement of Jesus took place in consequence of His hearing of the violent death of John, and as a precautionary measure. St. Mark states distinctly that it was for the sake of quiet; His teaching and that of His disciples having so roused men's minds that they were followed and thronged in every place. These two reasons do, in fact, run up into one. Luke assigns no reason. Matthew and Mark both tell us that Jesus and His disciples both went to and returned from the "desert place" by ship. Both the voyage and the return are omitted by Luke. With the account of the miracle which followed (verses 10-17) compare and see notes on Matt. xiv. 13-21; Mark vi. 30-44; John vi. 1-13.

*into a desert, &c.*] Perhaps we ought to read "**into a city called Bethsaida.**" See note on Mark vi. 45. The name Bethsaida is omitted in the Sinaitic Codex. Resch, *l.c.* p. 665, gives strong reasons for regarding it as an explanatory gloss.

**11.** *healed them that had need.*] Mentioned in Matt. xiv. 14, but not in Mark vi. 34, where our Lord's teaching only is mentioned. These points are combined in the text.

**12.** *And when the day.*] Or "**Now the day began to wear away; and the twelve came,**" &c.

**13.** *Give ye them.*] The conversation, as repeated in Mark vi. 37, 38, is somewhat more full of detail. The suggestion of "two hundred pennyworth of bread" there referred to does not appear in Matthew or in Mark. But it is given in John vi. 5-9, where the conversation is more fully repeated, and where Philip and Andrew are expressly named as having taken part in it. There is, however, a trace of Philip's suggestion (John vi. 7, comp. Mark vi. 37) in the last words of this verse.

**14.** *about five thousand men.*] So SS. Matthew, Mark, and John: the word used by all the Evangelists for "men", means adult males. We should therefore have inferred the presence of women and children also, even if St. Matthew (xiv. 21) had not expressly stated it.

**17.** Up to this point the narrative agrees closely with that of St. Mark, the only differences arising from omission, or condensation, and specially from disregard of geographical details. But between this and the following verse there is a considerable gap. St. Luke passes over a series of events related by St. Mark vii. 24, viii. 26. It is important to notice this for two reasons; (1) because it is the most striking instance of St. Luke's habit of avoiding any approach to repetition: that portion of St. Mark's Gospel records events for which parallels are found elsewhere in St. Luke; (2) because it supplies a strong argument against the theory that St. Luke was guided throughout by one fixed purpose, that of giving prominence to all acts and sayings which concerned the Gentiles. The missing portion expressly describes the proceedings of our Lord in heathen and semi-heathen districts, Phœnicia,

filled: and there was taken up of fragments that remained to them twelve baskets.

18 ¶ [f] And it came to pass, as he was alone praying, his disciples were with him: and he asked them, saying, Whom say the people that I am?

f Matt. 16. 13.

19 They answering said, John the Baptist; but some *say*, Elias; and others *say*, that one of the old prophets is risen again.

20 He said unto them, But whom say ye that I am? Peter answering said, The Christ of God.

21 And he straitly charged them, and commanded *them* to tell no man that thing;

22 Saying, [g] The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be slain, and be raised the third day.

g Matt. 17. 22.

23 ¶ [h] And he said to *them* all, If any *man* will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.

h Matt. 10. 38.

24 For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it.

25 [i] For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?

i Matt. 16. 26. Mark 8. 36.

26 [k] For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and *in his* Father's, and of the holy angels.

k Matt. 10. 33.

27 [l] But I tell you of a truth,

l Matt. 16. 28.

---

North Galilee, and Decapolis, and would have been especially interesting and important to the Evangelist, assuming his views to be such as are attributed to him by a certain school of critics. See Resch, *l. c.*, 1876, p. 661.

18–27. The Confession of St. Peter and Charges to the Disciples.

**18.** *And it came to pass.*] With this brief formula St. Luke transports his readers to a different time and place. The transaction which he now relates occurred on the way to Cæsarea Philippi, see note on Mark viii. 27. The narrative which follows (verses 18-27) agrees closely with Matt. xvi. 13-28; Mark viii. 27-38; where see notes.

*as he was alone praying.*] This is not elsewhere mentioned in connexion with the confession of St. Peter. But in this statement of St. Luke's we seem to find a vestige of that which is stated by St. Matthew and St. Mark, immediately after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, namely, that Jesus departed into a mountain to pray, and, as St. Matthew adds, "was there alone." (Matt. xiv. 23; Mark vi. 46.)

**19.** *the old prophets.*] The expression is peculiar to St. Luke, both here and in the similar place in which it is found (verse 8).

**20.** *The Christ of God.*] The three Evangelists phrase Peter's answer somewhat differently. St. Matthew gives it at the greatest length; St. Mark most succinctly. The answers are virtually the same. Then follows in Matt. xvi. 17-19 the blessing and promise to Peter which is wanting in the other Gospels.

**22.** *The Son of man.*] After the prediction of the Passion and Resurrection, in which the three Gospels agree closely, SS. Matthew and Mark place the rebuke of Peter, and the reproof which it drew forth from our Lord. This is wanting here—a point of importance in its bearing upon the feelings of St. Luke, the disciple of St. Paul, towards the older Apostle; but a trace of it remains in the discourse on self-denial which follows, which is closely connected with it, and which appears in the three Gospels.

**23.** *to them all.*] Including, according to Mark viii. 34, both His disciples and the people. In the short discourse which follows there is no material difference between the Evangelists except as regards the warning against false shame and the prediction of a future judgment.

*will.*] *I. e.* "Willeth," or "desireth to:" so also in the first clause of verse 24.

**24.** *will lose.*] Rather, "**Shall lose.**"

**25.** *be cast away.*] Rather, "**Suffer damage.**" This is opposed to "gain," as "lose" is to "save."

**26.** *For whosoever shall.*] In this clause SS. Mark and Luke agree. St. Matthew has in the place of it a direct assertion of the judgment to come (which is here assumed) and no warning against being ashamed of Christ.

**27.** *But I tell you.*] This clause is found with no material variation in the three Evan-

there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God.

[a] Matt. 17. 1.
[1] Or, *things*.

28 ¶ [a]And it came to pass about an eight days after these [1]sayings, he took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray.

29 And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment *was* white *and* glistering.

30 And, behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias:

31 Who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.

32 But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him.

33 And it came to pass, as they departed from him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias: not knowing what he said.

34 While he thus spake, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them: and they feared as they entered into the cloud.

35 And there came a voice out

---

gelists at the end of the discourse which it is here made to close. Compare and see notes on Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1.

*standing here.*] Or, "**Of them that stand here.**"

28–36. THE TRANSFIGURATION.

**28.** *And it came to pass.*] With the following account of the Transfiguration, compare and see notes on the parallel passages in Matt. xvii. 1-13; Mark ix. 1-13. In the three accounts the Transfiguration is made to follow the confession of St. Peter, and the conversation just recited, and by each Evangelist a definite interval of time is said to have elapsed since the events last narrated. SS. Matthew and Mark speak of this interval as one of six days; St. Luke speaks of eight days. On this divergence of expression see note on Matt. xvii. 1. It may be observed that there is a close substantial agreement between the three accounts, combined with such difference of language as shews their independence of one another. It would not be easy to say which two of the Evangelists agree most with each other as against the third.

*took Peter and John and James.*] "**Took with him Peter and John and James.**"

*to pray.*] Compare verse 29. This is mentioned by St. Luke alone. See also ch. iii. 21, where St. Luke (and he only) tells us that Jesus was praying when the Holy Ghost descended upon Him, and a voice was heard from heaven, at the time of His Baptism.

**29.** *white and glistering.*] Or, "**Sparkling white:**" Mark adds, "as snow." Matthew alone tells us that "his face did shine as the sun."

**31.** *Who appeared.*] The other Synoptists state that Moses and Elias were talking with Jesus: St. Luke alone tells us the subject of their conversation. It was the "decease" (literally "departure" out of this world) which Jesus should fulfil at Jerusalem. The word, as Godet shews, is especially chosen to include the Death and the Ascension of Christ. See on verse 51. Judging partly from peculiarities of style, partly from the tone of the narrative, we may perhaps infer (with Resch, *l. c.*, p. 671), that St. Luke derived this notice from the same source as that which supplied the materials for the large portions from ch. ix. 51 to xviii. 17, which is peculiar to this Evangelist.

**32.** *But Peter.*] This verse also is peculiar to St. Luke. He alone tells us that the disciples were "heavy with sleep." The next words, however, may be rendered, "but having kept awake," implying a successful struggle against the heaviness.

**33.** *as they departed from him.*] Or, "**As they were being separated from Him.**" *I. e.* Moses and Elias (compare ch. xxiv. 51). This is not mentioned in the parallel passages.

*not knowing what he said.*] This explanation appears only in Mark and Luke: the former adds, "for they were sore afraid."

**34.** *there came a cloud.*] So also SS. Matthew and Mark; the former alone says that it was a bright cloud. St. Luke here adds that "they (the disciples) feared as they (Moses and Elias) entered into the cloud." The cloud came and concealed the forms of the prophets from the eyes of the disciples, even as Jesus Himself was afterwards received up to glory in a cloud which hid Him from their sight. Acts i. 9.

of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him.

36 And when the voice was past, Jesus was found alone. And they kept *it* close, and told no man in those days any of those things which they had seen.

[b] Matt. 17. 14.

37 ¶ [b]And it came to pass, that on the next day, when they were come down from the hill, much people met him.

38 And, behold, a man of the company cried out, saying, Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son: for he is mine only child.

39 And, lo, a spirit taketh him, and he suddenly crieth out; and it teareth him that he foameth again, and bruising him hardly departeth from him.

40 And I besought thy disciples to cast him out; and they could not.

41 And Jesus answering said, O

---

35. *This is my beloved Son.*] So in the other Evangelists. Matthew alone adds, "in whom I am well pleased" (compare Matt. iii. 17; ch. iii. 22). For "beloved" in the text, there is another well-supported reading, viz. "elect" or "chosen." It is found in ℵ B, and accepted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. Independently of any question of external evidence, it is more probable that "beloved" should have been substituted for "elect," than that the contrary should have taken place. We are therefore very probably to read "**chosen.**" Compare Isai. xlii. 1.

36. *And when the voice.*] SS. Matthew and Mark recount what followed somewhat more fully. The former tells us that Jesus charged the three disciples to conceal what they had seen, until after His resurrection from the dead. St. Luke, in this verse, tells us that they did so, but does not mention the command. St. Mark mentions both the command, and the disciples' observance of it. SS. Matthew and Mark subjoin to their account of the Transfiguration a short report (here wanting) of a conversation which took place between our Lord and the three favoured disciples, on their way down from the mount, on the expected return of Elijah, whom He declares to have come again in the person of John the Baptist. The omission has been regarded by some critics as an indication of St. Luke's tendency to avoid references to events specially interesting to Hebrews. It is best accounted for by Resch, *l.c.*, who points out that St. Luke has already recorded our Lord's judgment concerning John the Baptist, on ch. vii. 24-35, and i. 17, and, as usual, avoids repetition.

37–45. THE HEALING AT THE FOOT OF THE MOUNTAIN.

37. *on the next day.*] The three Synoptists still follow the same order, and place the miracle which follows immediately after the Transfiguration (with verses 37-42 compare and see notes on Matt. xvii. 14-21; Mark ix. 14-29). Here St. Mark, as usual, is the most precise and full of detail. His narrative places the whole scene before our eyes in a wonderfully vivid manner. It occupies here a middle position between Matthew and Luke. St. Luke also states directly that the occurrence took place on the day after the Transfiguration. This is quite consistent with the other accounts, and supposing the Transfiguration to have occurred in the night, which may perhaps be inferred from verse 32, the cure of the demoniac child, which all agree in placing immediately after the descent of Jesus from the mountain, took place on the following morning.

*much people.*] Or, "**A great crowd.**" St. Matthew says nothing of the crowd: he speaks only of the father's petition. St. Mark, on the other hand, describes the wild excitement of the people.

38. *And, behold.*] Or, "**And, behold, a man came from the crowd and shouted out, saying.**" St. Matthew tells us that he came and knelt before Jesus.

*mine only child.*] Peculiar to St. Luke: compare and see note on ch. viii. 42.

39. *he suddenly crieth out.*] There is some doubt whether this should not be rendered "it suddenly crieth out" (*i.e.* the evil spirit). This is the more obvious translation, as that of our Authorised Version involves a change of construction in the original text. So it is taken by Bleek, Oosterzee, and others (compare ch. iv. 41). Meyer, however, points out that the word which we render "suddenly" indicates a consequence from the seizure by the spirit, and takes the boy as the subject of the verb "crieth out." It is so rendered also by Kuinöl and De Wette. Probably this is the true construction, and we may translate the passage thus, "And behold, a spirit seizeth him, and at once he shrieketh, and it teareth him," &c. On the physical characteristics of this attack see note on Mark, *l.c.*

faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you, and suffer you? Bring thy son hither.

42 And as he was yet a coming, the devil threw him down, and tare *him*. And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and healed the child, and delivered him again to his father.

43 ¶ And they were all amazed at the mighty power of God. But while they wondered every one at all things which Jesus did, he said unto his disciples,

44 [c] Let these sayings sink down into your ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered into the hands of men.

45 But they understood not this saying, and it was hid from them, that they perceived it not: and they feared to ask him of that saying.

46 ¶ [d] Then there arose a reason-

c Matt. 17. 22.

d Matt. 18. 1. Mark 9. 34.

---

**42.** *And as he was yet.*] This attack which took place in the presence of Jesus, is not mentioned by St. Matthew at all. We find it in Mark ix. 20; and that Evangelist interposes, between it and the final cure, a touching conversation between our Lord and the father of the child (Mark ix. 21-24).

*delivered him again.*] Compare and see note on ch. vii. 15. SS. Matthew and Mark here add a question put to Jesus by His disciples ("Why could not we cast him out?"), and our Lord's reply. There is probably a trace of this conversation in St. Luke's account, in the first clause of verse 43 describing the impression produced by this wonderful work. The conversation, which took place under the influence of this impression, does not appear in this place; the impression itself is recorded in terms which are peculiar to this Gospel.

**43.** *But while they.*] St. Luke appears to connect the declaration which follows (verses 44, 45; compare and see notes on Matt. xvii. 22, 23; Mark ix. 30-32) with the effect produced on the minds of the disciples, not merely by our Lord's miracles in general, but more particularly by the work which has just been narrated. The Evangelist delights to trace a connexion between cause and effect. Accordingly, with his usual disregard of local details, he passes over what appears from the two parallel narratives, viz., that Jesus had left the place where He had healed the demoniac child, and was now on his way through Galilee. The announcement of His death (the second made by Him; see verse 22) is more fully given by the first two Evangelists, who also tell us that He foretold His resurrection. But the impression produced on the disciples' minds is given most fully by St. Luke, with whose words the language of St. Mark (though more condensed) has much in common. St. Luke, as De Wette observes, places in marked contrast the wonder and admiration excited by the works of Christ, and the announcement of His approaching death. The words of Christ were calculated to check the disciples' hope of an earthly kingdom.

*which Jesus did.*] Or according to the commonly received reading, "Which Jesus had done." (His miracles generally, with especial reference to that which He had so recently wrought.) But the reading of all the most important MSS must be rendered, "**Which Jesus was doing,**" *i.e.* "did continually;" and this must be understood with reference to the entire series of miracles which is regarded as not yet completed.

**45.** *that they perceived it not.*] Rather, "**That they should not perceive it.**" The meaning of the words was concealed from them by a higher power, to keep them for a time in ignorance (Meyer, De Wette, Godet).

46–50. THE GREAT LESSONS ON HUMILITY AND BROTHERLY LOVE.

**46.** *Then there arose.*] Or "**Then there came in.**" With the following account compare and see notes on Matt. xvii. 24–xviii. 35. The first two Evangelists agree in saying that Jesus and His disciples came to Capernaum after the second announcement of His Passion which has just been recited. St. Matthew then mentions the miracle of the tribute-money (noticed by him alone), and then tells us that the disciples "came unto Jesus saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" Then follows the action recorded in verse 47, and a lengthened discourse, including the words which occur in verse 48. The discourse contains many sayings which occur in other contexts in St. Mark and St. Luke, as well as much which is peculiar to St. Matthew. But it does not contain the short conversation with John, given *vv.* 49, 50. St. Mark, as usual, is more explicit as to time. He informs us that the dispute between the disciples had occurred on the way to Capernaum, but that Jesus questioned them as to the subject of it on their arrival. Then after the words which form the closing sentence of verse 48 follows the action mentioned verse 47, and the words which here accompany it ("Whosoever shall," &c.). The report of John which follows (verse 49), and

ing among them, which of them should be greatest.

47 And Jesus, perceiving the thought of their heart, took a child, and set him by him,

48 And said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same shall be great.

49 ¶ [e] And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us.

[e] Mark 9. 38.

50 And Jesus said unto him, Forbid *him* not: for he that is not against us is for us.

51 ¶ And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem,

---

the answer of Jesus (verse 50), come next (though they do not appear in Matthew at all), but the answer is given somewhat more fully. St. Mark also connects this conversation with the foregoing words of Jesus, first by saying (Mark ix. 38), "And John *answered him*, saying," &c. (as in verse 49), and then by presently reverting (Mark ix. 42; compare Matt. xviii. 6) to the "little ones which believe in me." Of these links the second is of course wanting in Luke, though the order is the same, so far as the narrative continues. But SS. Mark and Matthew append a lengthened discourse, which has much in common with the report in Matt. xviii., though there is nothing corresponding to it in the text. Finally, after the conclusion of these discourses, the first two Evangelists agree in saying that Jesus left Capernaum and travelled in the direction of Judæa.

*greatest.*] Matthew adds "in the kingdom of heaven."

**47.** *thought.*] "**Reasoning.**" The same word which is used in the previous verse.

*took.*] "**Laid hold of.**" The words of Jesus, as usual, are more fully reported by St. Matthew than by St. Mark or St. Luke. De Wette objects to the expression "this child" as out of place in the words of Jesus, and to those words (as reported by St. Luke) as wanting clearness and connexion. Meyer well explains the passage. "This child," the child whom Jesus set before His followers, stands as the type of the humble and childlike disciple: and (the dispute having been about the comparative greatness of the disciples) such a disciple is the greatest: he is so honoured by God, that he stands on earth as the representative of Christ, and of God Himself (verse 47), since "he that is (willingly) least among you all, the same shall be (truly) great" (verse 48).

**49.** *in thy name.*] This is the connecting link between the speech of John and the foregoing words of Jesus. Our Lord had spoken of receiving a little child, or one who was like a little child, "in His name." This suggests to John to speak of that which had been attempted, or effected, in the name of Christ. With regard to the incident, see note on Mark ix. 38.

**50.** *Forbid him not.*] St. Mark adds, "for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me," and then continues as in the text.

*against us is for us.*] The great preponderance of MS authority, and of that of ancient versions, is in favour of the following reading, "**He that is not against you is for you.**" There is a similar confusion in Mark ix. 40, where see note.

51–56. Beginning of Journey towards Jerusalem; the Samaritan Village.

**51.** *And it came to pass.*] See Note at the end of the Chapter.

*when the time was.*] Properly "**When the days of his being taken up were being fulfilled.**" The words do not mean that the time for Jesus to be taken up was come, but that it was now drawing near. (See, however, Acts ii. 1, and the note on that passage.) By His being "taken up" is meant His ascension, the close of His manifestation upon earth (compare Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 2, 11; 1 Tim. iii. 16, where the cognate verb is used in the original text); but the entire series of events, commencing with the Passion and ending with the Resurrection, may be regarded as one act, marking the termination of His earthly life and ministry. Compare the use of the word "decease," or departure, *v.* 31 (where see note) to signify the same series of events, and the frequent use of the expression "lift up" in St. John's Gospel to signify the death of Christ, but apparently with a further allusion to His glorious ascension (John iii. 14; viii. 28; xii. 32).

*he stedfastly set his face.*] The expression evidently means something more than that Jerusalem was the end of the journey and the direction in which it tended. it implies

52 And sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him.

53 And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem.

54 And when his disciples James and John saw *this*, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to

---

that Jesus looked forward to dangers and obstacles to be encountered and surmounted. There seems also to be a reminiscence of Jer. xxi. 10, "For I have set my face against this city for evil, and not for good, saith the Lord" (the verb in the original being the same which occurs in the LXX version of that passage). Jesus had spent much time in Galilee, and even among half heathen districts: see notes on Mark vii. 24 and 31. He now turned His face steadily towards the centre of Jewish life, where He was soon about to "accomplish His decease," or departure out of this world (verse 31). The expression is probably used in anticipation of the refusal of the Samaritans to entertain our Lord, mentioned below, verse 53. The Evangelist wishes us to understand that He set out with the fixed determination of travelling to Jerusalem; and that although the inhospitable conduct of the Samaritans turned Him aside out of the direct road, this object was never lost sight of.

**52.** *sent messengers.*] He was accompanied by so great a train of disciples, including the Twelve, the women specifically mentioned ch. viii. 2, 3 (who are said, Matt. xxvii. 55, to have "followed Jesus from Galilee") and, no doubt, others who are not named (see verses 57-62), that it was necessary to make preparation for their reception as well as for that of chance hearers, who were attracted by His teaching or by His miracles, and followed Him from place to place (*v.* 11). The difficulty in the wilderness of Bethsaida had shewn the necessity of making such provision (*v.* 12), and although our Lord had then shewn that He had resources at hand, yet He never wrought an unnecessary miracle.

**53.** *did not receive him.*] The ordinary road from Galilee to Jerusalem lay through the country of Samaria (John iv. 4); and it appears that the Galileans ordinarily took this route on their way to attend the Jewish feasts. Commentators have therefore found some difficulty in explaining the ground of the special opposition manifested on this occasion, simply because the face of Jesus was "as though he would go to Jerusalem." Meyer thinks that the Samaritans were especially excited against Jesus, because He was announced to them by His messengers as the Messiah, and that they argued that one who went up to worship at Jerusalem instead of Gerizim (John iv. 20) must be a false pretender. This, however, is an entirely gratuitous supposition. There was at all times, as we know, a rancorous feeling between Jews and Samaritans (John iv. 9; viii. 48), and this would be likely to break out into unusual violence at the time of the great festivals (Olshausen), and all the more so, because the proper place of worship was the main object in dispute. If, as seems most probable, our Lord was then going up to the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple, there would be special cause for the animosity of these Samaritans. See Resch, *l.c.*, p. 674, notes on verse 51, and on ch. x. 2. This is not inconsistent with the assertion that the Galilean Jews ordinarily travelled through Samaria to attend the great feasts at Jerusalem. The bigoted opposition to the Jewish religion, which is here spoken of, would be very likely to exist much more strongly in some places than in others, and would be sure to be strongest of all in a country village. In these days a Frank, to whom would be accorded admission into a mosque in Constantinople, would be pelted and followed with execrations in a Mohammedan village. Moreover, there is nothing in the text to shew that the Samaritan villagers, mentioned in this place, manifested any active opposition; it is merely said that "they did not receive him," not that they would not let Him pass, but that they would not help or entertain Him, so that it became necessary to take another route.

**54.** *James and John.*] The circumstance accords remarkably with the temper and character of the two sons of Zebedee, such as it must have been when their Master named them "Sons of Thunder" (Mark iii. 17, where see note). It has been thought that James and John were themselves the messengers mentioned in verse 52. Perhaps, however, a graphic trait which follows in verse 55, may help us to decide against the supposition. Our Lord would seem to have been walking as usual (compare Matt. xvi. 23; John xxi. 20) at the head of His company of disciples. On hearing the untimely suggestion of James and John "he turned and rebuked them." It follows that they were in His train. The messengers would have met Him face to face. But in point of fact it is scarcely conceivable that the two disciples would have been named at this point and not before, if they had been the messengers

come down from heaven, and consume them, even as *f* Elias did?

*f* 2 Kings 1. 10.

55 But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.

56 For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save *them*. And they went to another village.

57 ¶ *g* And it came to pass, that, as they went in the way, a certain *man* said unto him, Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.

*g* Matt. 8. 19.

58 And Jesus said unto him, Foxes have holes, and birds of the air *have* nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay *his* head.

---

whose rejection is chronicled in the foregoing verse.

*even as Elias did.*] See 2 Kings i. 10-12. These words are wanting in ℵ B L, and are rejected by Tischendorf and Tregelles from the text. They may possibly be a gloss, but certainly of great antiquity, being found in nearly all other MSS, and in most ancient Versions. In any case we may see in the words of the disciples an allusion to the act of Elijah. And there is probably a connexion between their suggestion and the vision which they had so recently witnessed (verse 30). They had learned from the Divine visit (verse 35) that their Master, the beloved Son of God, was now to be "heard" even more than the Law or the Prophets, and they concluded that He, and those who were with Him, wielded the corrective power intrusted of old to Elijah. It may be inferred from Rev. xi. 5 (where there is a palpable allusion to the history of Elijah) that his calling down fire from heaven (1 Kings xviii. 38, as well as 2 Kings i. 10) was regarded as an especially salient point in his history.

**55.** *and said.*] The words "and said . . . save them" are wanting in the most important uncial MSS. They are omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. Griesbach and Meyer exclude only the words "For the Son . . . save them." On the other hand they are retained wholly in some, and partly in many, ancient uncial MSS, and versions, and are recognised by early Fathers of high authority. They bear the impress of the Great Teacher, and critics of different schools admit that it is to the last degree unlikely that they should have been interpolated. See Meyer. The lesson which they teach is of the highest importance, whether we adopt the interpretation, "Ye do not know of what spirit ye are, who call for such an act," *i.e.* you feel not as Christians, but as Jews, or "Ye do not as yet realise the feelings which ought to actuate you and will actuate you, if ye are moved by the spirit which breathes in Christians."

*to another village.*] It does not quite appear whether this was a Galilean or a Samaritan village. It is pretty clear from the context that the occurrence just related took place on the borders of Samaria and Galilee, so that it might very well have been either. Godet decides in favour of the former supposition, on the ground that, if it had been a Samaritan village, the contrast between the conduct of the neighbouring villagers would have been expressly brought forward in the text. Resch, on the contrary, assigns strong, if not conclusive, reasons in support of the view that our Lord continued this missionary journey through Samaria; see notes on ch. x. 2, and 8.

57–62. Sifting of Applicants.

**57.** *as they went in the way.*] Rather "**as they were going, a certain man said unto him by the way.**" Meyer points out that the ordinary translation, connecting the words "in the way" with those which precede them, makes them superfluous and unmeaning. The words "as they went," or "as they were going" are to be understood, not of the commencement, but of the continuance of the journey (De Wette). This is sufficiently shewn by "on the way," however it be taken. Meyer connects this passage closely with the foregoing. "As they were going," *i.e.* to the "other village," mentioned in verse 56. The verb is the same in both clauses, which makes Meyer's interpretation probable. The passage (verses 57-62) occurs also in Matt. viii. 19-22, with certain slight variations, and with the exception of verses 61-62, which are peculiar to St. Luke, Matthew places the incident immediately before the passage of the sea of Tiberias (recorded also ch. viii. 22), and as it would seem, just at the moment of departure. The question arises, to which period it really belongs. If it occurred once only there can be little doubt that St. Luke gives it in its right place. The conversations do not merely suit the position in which we here find them on account of the relation which their inward teaching bears to the circumstances of our Lord's journey, but also because the conversations themselves are likely to have taken place in the course of that journey. It may be added that the whole series of conversations finds a remark-

[h] Matt. 8. 21.

59 [h] And he said unto another, Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father.

60 Jesus said unto him, Let the dead bury their dead: but go thou and preach the kingdom of God.

61 And another also said, Lord, I will follow thee; but let me first go bid them farewell, which are at home at my house.

62 And Jesus said unto him, No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.

---

ably appropriate position immediately after the refusal of the Samaritan villagers (verse 53). This is especially true of the mournful expression which we read in verse 58, and which would be far less suitable if we suppose it to have been spoken at Capernaum (Matt. viii. 5, 20), a place which is almost immediately afterwards spoken of as "His own city." We should also keep in mind the probability, admitted by many critics, that similar events, eliciting similar words, occurred more than once in our Lord's history. That St. Luke should omit one notice accords with his general style. The omission here by St. Matthew is probably owing to this having taken place in a part of the history which he has not dealt with.

**59.** *And he said.*] Compare and see note on Matt. viii. 21, 22; St. Luke only records the command "Follow me:" St. Matthew speaks of the person here addressed as "another of his disciples," *i.e.* apparently one of His hearers. Lastly, the last clause of verse 60 is wanting in Matthew. It explains the proverbial and paradoxical expression which is common to both the Evangelists. To perform the last duties to his father, was no doubt a duty incumbent on the disciple, but here was a higher duty suddenly imposed upon him. Any man, even "the dead" in spirit could bury the dead: *he* was called to higher things. Godet points out that the law provided for a conflict of duties in a similar case (Lev. xxi. 10-12; Numb. vi. 6-7; compared with Numb. xix. 11-14).

**61.** *And another also.*] The remainder of the chapter is peculiar to St. Luke. It is impossible to dissociate it from the foregoing. First we have the offer of a self-confident spirit, checked by a severe test of perseverance; then a command to a cautious follower, accompanied by an intimation that the work to which he was called was the highest duty; lastly, a conditional offer, such as might be expected to be made by one who had witnessed our Lord's treatment of the two other hearers. In fact, the whole scene is given complete, and (as it would seem) in its own place, by St. Luke. It occurred after our Lord had completed His work in Galilee, and was on His way to meet death in Jerusalem. There was then no time for delay; those who would be with Him must at once take up their cross and follow Him.

*go bid them farewell.*] Rather, "**To go to my house and bid farewell to those**" (or "**have done with the things,**" the original verb is so used in ch. xiv. 33) "**that are there.**" There is some difficulty in choosing between the two interpretations. The second is preferred by some on the ground that the mere act of bidding farewell would not require any great delay; and by Meyer, because (as he thinks) our Lord's answer is more suitable to it. Godet takes the other view, and so (apparently) does Oosterzee, who points out the remarkable resemblance between this passage and 1 Kings xix. 19-21; even the form of the answer, as both Bengel and Godet suggest, may contain an allusion to the occupation of Elisha when called by Elijah. We may observe that the resemblance here pointed out between the two events is tempered by one remarkable contrast. The permission accorded to Elisha is here refused to the disciple who offers to follow. A more complete and unconditional self-devotion is required by Christ than it would have been found possible to impose under a less perfect dispensation: here it was required at a critical period.

**62.** *fit.*] Compare ch. xiv. 33.

## NOTE on verse 51.

The entire section beginning with this verse and extending to ch. xviii. 14, is independent of the other Synoptists, especially of St. Mark, whom St. Luke has followed most closely in the preceding chapters. An important note on the relation of this portion to the other Evangelists will be found at the end of Matt. xviii. A somewhat different view is here advocated. Repeated examination of the portion, aided by late investigations, has convinced the present writer that our Evangelist occupies a peculiar position as regards both the discourses and the transactions here recorded. The parables differ in important points from those which were delivered in the earlier part of our Lord's ministry. They are generally much longer, and founded on personal narratives rather than on natural analogies, while the doctrinal lessons which they specially enforce resemble those of which we find the strongest traces in the writings of St. Paul. The whole course of events opens a series of discourses and ministrations, of which few traces are found in the other Evangelists. The style, unlike that of the first two chapters, has comparatively few Hebraisms, and, like other portions which touch on points omitted by St. Mark (see note on ch. vi. 18), are more classical in tone. In fact, it is chiefly from this section that critics draw their illustrations of St. Luke's characteristics, whose gospel is said by one of the ablest among those who reject all idea of supernatural intervention, to be the most beautiful book in existence. "C'est le plus beau livre qu'il y ait" (Renan, 'Les Évangiles,' p. 283).

There are, indeed, many passages of doctrinal import which correspond closely with St. Matthew, but critics of very different schools have shewn that they are not derived from that Gospel. (Cf. Renan, *l.c.*, p. 260.) They occur in distinct connexion with transactions which this Evangelist alone records. It is possible in some cases where the similarity or identity is unquestionable, that having the same documents before him, St. Matthew displaced the accounts, in pursuance of his general intention to present our Lord's teaching in a systematic form. (See note on Matt. v. 1.) But it is far more probable that our Lord, having a different set of hearers on those occasions, intentionally repeated what he had previously taught in Galilee.

With regard to the historical sequence, the natural impression made by the narrative is that it refers to the interval between our Lord's final departure from Galilee, and the time when St. Luke's account again coincides with that of the other Evangelists. Here, however, there is the greatest possible divergence of opinions among critics. This is mainly owing to St. Luke's habit, especially noticeable in this section, of omitting to name places and to note events, save those which bear distinctly on the doctrinal teaching of our Lord. Still there are some notices of critical importance; even when places are not mentioned, the local colouring suggests the circumstances under which discourses were delivered; and a careful examination brings out points both of internal coherence, and of very striking coincidence with notices in other books, more especially with the statements of the fourth Evangelist. This is indeed a clear instance of the relation between the third and fourth Gospels, which is so close, as Renan observes, that this Gospel is, so to speak, an intermediate book between St. John and the first two Synoptists. See 'Les Évangiles,' p. 266, and the Appendix to the 15th edition of 'La Vie de Jésus,' p. 488. See also the two articles of Resch cited in the additional Note on ch. v. 16.

Thus St. John tells us that our Lord was in Jerusalem at the Feast of the Dedication in the winter before the Passion (ch. x. 22, 23).* St. Luke tells that when He left Galilee He first touched, perhaps traversed, Samaria (see note on ch. ix. 56); that He then passed into Peræa or Judæa (ch. x. 15), and arrived at Bethany (see on x. 38). Now Bethany was in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, which He would scarcely leave unvisited, though the visit, like many other events, is not here noticed by St. Luke. The omission by the Synoptists of all record of our Lord's visits to Jerusalem before the last, is one of the best known and most perplexing points in questions of harmony. We find accounts of them only in the fourth Gospel; but as in this instance, and in numerous others pointed out in this Commentary, St. Luke's narrative is full of suggestive notices best explained by reference to them. The journey must have occupied a considerable time, not much short of two months, during great part of which the Seventy were probably at work.

---

* The historical character, indeed the rigorous precision of the topographical details in the latter part of this chapter is recognised by Renan, 'V. de J.' 15^me^ édition, p. 503.

On leaving Jerusalem we learn from St. John, x. 40–42, that our Lord went away beyond Jordan to the place where John at first baptized; that he remained there some time, and made numerous converts among the many who resorted to Him.

St. Luke, as usual, does not notice the change of place; but, after relating the visit to Bethany in ch. xi., he records the question of a disciple referring to the former teaching of John the Baptist. We have here a remarkable trace of the rivalry between the disciples of our Lord and those of the Baptist, to which St. John repeatedly alludes. No place, no occasion could be more appropriate for the question then proposed. Such a coincidence could scarcely be fortuitous. The section from xi. 1 to xiii. 30 is entirely occupied by accounts of our Lord's teaching in the same district, of the gathering together of hearers in great numbers (xi. 29; xii. 1), of discourses indicating increased influence, and as in Galilee increasing antagonism (ch. xi. 14, 16, 27, 29, 37, 39, 53; xii. 1, 13, &c.). There seem also to be indications of the season, the first burst of a sub-tropical spring (ch. xii. 16, 24, 27, 28, 54).

We next learn from St. John that at the close of that period, probably about the end of February, our Lord, at the call of the sisters of Lazarus, went again to Bethany, but after *a short delay of two days* (John xi. 6).

St. Luke informs us that, being menaced by the Pharisees, He intimated the intention to leave the territory of Herod, but *after a short delay of two days* (xiii. 32, 33; where see notes). Immediately afterwards comes the touching address to Jerusalem, with notice of previous visits, such as St. John alone has recorded.

After the raising of Lazarus, St. John tells us that our Lord went to *the* district (see note on John xi. 54) near the wilderness, to Ephraim, and continued there with His disciples; and also that the Sanhedrim sought to compass His death.

St. Luke has more than four chapters full of discourses which at that time were specially addressed to the disciples, with indications of craft and of enmity on the part of the Pharisees (xiv. 1; xv. 2). In ch. xvii. 11 (where see note), we have a geographical notice, very rare in this Evangelist, which has much perplexed commentators, which Resch even proposes to correct, substituting Judæa for Galilee. It represents our Lord as passing through the midst, or through the borders, of Samaria and Galilee on His way to Jerusalem. This may be accounted for, and as it would seem satisfactorily, if He went from Ephraim, near the southern boundary of Samaria, towards Peræa, where He appears to have been at the time when St. Luke's narrative again coincides with that of the other Synoptists. (See notes on Mark x. 1.)

The length of this entire portion is not surprising if we bear in mind the fact that St. Luke, who is singularly concise in dealing with events recorded by St. Mark, on the contrary abounds in details and writes in a far more flowing and elaborate style when he follows other authorities, whether written or oral. The sources indeed which he uses are matters of conjecture. Of one thing we may feel assured. St. Luke gives the results of careful inquiry; and if the account given in this note be substantially correct, he presents those results "in order" (ch. i. 3).

The extent to which St. Luke omits notices of places and transactions, keeping our attention fixed upon our Lord's discourses, may be easily realised by comparing his narrative from *v.* 18 to 51 of this ninth chapter with that of St. Mark from ch. viii. 27 to ch. x. 1.

## CHAPTER X.

1 *Christ sendeth out at once seventy disciples to work miracles, and to preach*: 17 *admonisheth them to be humble, and wherein to rejoice*: 21 *thanketh his Father for his grace*: 23 *magnifieth the happy estate of his church*: 25 *teacheth the lawyer how to attain eternal life, and to take every one for his neighbour that needeth his mercy*: 41 *reprehendeth Martha, and commendeth Mary her sister.*

AFTER [a]these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself would come.

[a] Matt. 10. 1.

2 Therefore said he unto them,

---

CHAP. X.—1-24. THE MISSION OF THE SEVENTY.

1. *After these things.*] *I. e.* after the events recorded, ch. ix. 57-62. Our Lord made trial of His instruments before using them. The mission of the Seventy disciples here recorded is only found in St. Luke's Gospel: the other Evangelists do not give an account of this circuit; it did not fall within their province to notice the appointment of the "Seventy," who were in fact not ordained to a permanent office. We are thus able to understand how it is that we hear nothing of the Seventy in later times, *e. g.* in the Acts of the Apostles. This has been made an objection to the authenticity of this part of St. Luke's narrative. But when it is considered that the Evangelist was also the writer of the Acts, the fact becomes an argument in favour of the truth of his narrative, particularly if we remember the eagerness shewn by ecclesiastical tradition to connect the names of persons afterwards remarkable (*e. g.* Mark, Matthias, and Philip) with the mission of the Seventy. In ch. ix. 1-6, Matt. x., we have an account of our Lord's sending forth the Twelve through Northern Galilee. In this His solemn progress towards Jerusalem He preferred to retain the Twelve near His own Person, sending out other messengers to awaken in the minds of men a sense of the nearness of God's Kingdom. "It is well," says Alford, "that Luke has given us also the sending of *the Twelve*; or we should have had some of the commentators asserting that this was *the same* mission." The same writer points out that the charge to the Twelve, given fully in Matt. x. "speaks plainly of an office founded, and a ministry appointed which was to involve a work, and embrace consequences, *co-extensive*, both in space and duration, *with the world*." The charge to the Seventy, on the other hand, has reference only to present and temporary objects. It may, however, be admitted that they represented the great body of teachers, whose duty it is to prepare His way before Him.

*the Lord.*] Of course the Lord Jesus, of whom the word is especially used in the records of this journey. It occurs but rarely (*sc.* in ch. i. 43; ii. 11); in other parts of St. Luke's history: see ch. vii. 13, and (if genuine) 31. St. Mark is even more sparing in the use of this designation, reserving it for the last period of our Lord's history; see note on Mark xvi. 19.

*appointed.*] Literally, "Pointed out," or "set forth." The word implies a solemn inauguration into office.

*other seventy also.*] With whom, then, are these seventy messengers contrasted? Meyer and Resch think that they are opposed to the messengers despatched into Samaria (ch. ix. 52). This indeed seems to be the natural explanation. But the mission of the Seventy was clearly something of a much more solemn and formal character, since they receive a charge and authority to preach and heal (verse 9), like the Twelve (ch. ix. 1, 2), whereas the messengers spoken of in ch. ix. 52, appear to have been sent merely in order to provide sufficient accommodation for our Lord and His followers. It is inferred therefore that their mission is here contrasted with that of the Twelve.

*seventy.*] In B D and some other MSS the reading is "seventy-two;" perhaps, as Alford says, a traditional correction to bring the text into accordance with the number of the Sanhedrim: but there is much confusion between these numbers in other cases (*e.g.* in that of the LXX translators) arising out of their both being formed by the multiplication of mystical numbers. In the special number chosen, allusions have been found to the seventy elders chosen by Moses (Numb. xi. 16-25), to the numbers of the Sanhedrim, to the seventy palm-trees at Elim (Exod. xv. 27: Bengel), or to a Rabbinical notion, founded on Gen. x., that the human race consisted of 70 nations.

*would come.*] "**Was about to come.**" This mission extended to the whole district about to be traversed by our Lord, including Peræa, and probably great part of Samaria and Judæa. See notes on ix. 51, 56.

2. *Therefore said he.*] Perhaps we should read, "Now he said." The charge which follows has much in common with that delivered to the Twelve (Matt. x. 5, *seq.*) and passages found in different positions in the

[k] Matt. 9. 37. [k]The harvest truly *is* great, but the labourers *are* few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest.

[l] Matt. 10. 16. 3 Go your ways: [l]behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves.

4 Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way.

[m] Matt. 10. 11. 5 [m]And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace *be* to this house.

6 And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again.

7 And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house.

8 And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you:

9 And heal the sick that are there-

---

other Gospels. On its relation to the charge in Matt. x. see note at the end of this chapter.

*The harvest.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. ix. 37, 38. A similar saying is recorded to have been uttered with reference to the Samaritans (John iv. 35). Resch observes that this saying has a peculiar fitness as applied to Samaria; compared with worn-out Galilee (see *vv.* 13-16), and barren Judæa, Samaria was a fresh field promising an abundant harvest.

**3.** *behold, I send.*] Or, according to the reading followed by the A.V., "Behold, it is I who send." Compare and see notes on Matt. x. 16, where the same expression is followed by other words of warning.

**4.** *Carry neither.*] A similar direction appears in the charge to the Twelve, Matt. x. 9, 10; ch. ix. 3; where see note.

*and salute no man.*] This injunction does not appear in the similar charge to the Twelve. It is a direction to the messengers to go straight to their object, and not to waste time or thought upon secondary matters: compare 2 Kings iv. 29. Eastern salutations were tedious and over-burdened with ceremony, There seems, moreover, to be an antithesis intended, between salutations "by the way," and the message of peace (the ordinary form, as it will be remembered, of oriental greeting), to be delivered *in the house* which the messengers might enter. It is at the domestic hearth that they must deliver their message.

**5.** *and into.*] Compare Matt. x. 12; but the direction is more fully expressed here, and the next verse has no parallel elsewhere. "Peace," as we know, was the usual form of greeting. But the disciples were directed to convey a message of peace of a better and higher kind (compare John xiv. 27). And this message was to bring peace to such only as were capable of receiving it called here, in Hebrew phraseology, the Sons of Peace, (comp. John xvii. 12; Eph. ii. 3; v. 6); not altogether the same as "who in it is worthy" in the similar but not parallel passage, Matt. x. 11. The meaning here is that the disciples were to communicate their message of peace, as the Prophet of old was to communicate his message of warning, (Ezek. iii. 17-21) to all, whether "worthy" or not. And it is promised to them that even if their message falls on inattentive ears or stubborn hearts, yet it shall not be fruitless, since the duty performed shall bring peace to themselves.

**7.** *in the same house.*] Rather, "**In that very house.**"

*such things as they give.*] So the original is fairly rendered. But it means more exactly "**such things as they have**" to give. They are to eat what is provided for them without scruple, for the reason given in the proverbial expression which follows, and which also occurs, Matt. x. 10. Compare verse 8.

**8.** *And into whatsoever.*] We are probably to read, "**and into whatsoever city too ye enter.**" This marks an antithesis between "city" and "house", and justifies the remark of Meyer, that in the previous part of the charge, the thought is chiefly of villages and detached houses.

*eat such things.*] The connexion between this and 1 Cor. x. 27 is obvious. Critics have seen in it a proof of the dependence of St. Luke upon St. Paul (Hilgenfeld, 'Einl.' p. 571); nor is there any reason to question the fact of such dependence. It has been observed that the resemblance between the Evangelist and the Apostle is strongest in those portions of the Gospel which do not coincide with the other Synoptists, especially in the section from ix. 51 to xviii. 14; and in this case it seems probable that both passages were derived from documents used specially by St. Luke and St. Paul. Here there is a peculiar suitableness in the injunction. The Seventy were sent before our Lord, probably to different parts of Samaria, see note on ch.

in, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.

10 But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say,

11 Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.

12 But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city.

13 [a]Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes.

[a] Matt. 11. 21.

14 But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment, than for you.

15 And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell.

16 [b]He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me.

[b] Matt. 10. 40.

17 ¶ And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name.

18 And he said unto them, I be-

---

ix. 56; now the more scrupulous Jews held it unlawful to eat with the Samaritans; their maxim was, "he who eateth a morsel belonging to a Samaritan is as though he ate swine's flesh." Our Lord, therefore, condemned that prejudice, having on a previous occasion Himself directed His disciples to buy food in a Samaritan city (John iv. 8). St. Paul generalises the precept, extending it to food eaten in the residence of Gentiles. It is sufficient and satisfactory to note the coincidence between St. Paul's teaching in an epistle which is specially remarkable for opposition to narrow Judaism, and that of our Saviour.

9. *The kingdom of God.*] Compare and see note on Matt. x. 7. God had drawn near to them for blessing, if they would have a blessing: if not, for judgment (verse 11). The same choice with like ulterior results, is offered here to cities and masses of men, which is before (verses 5, 6) offered to individuals. With the following direction to use a symbolical act of denunciation, compare Matt. x. 14, 15 (where see note); ch. ix. 5; and Acts xiii. 51, where we have an example of literal obedience to this precept.

13. *Woe unto thee.*] The following passage, verses 13-15, occurs, with a slight addition, in Matt. xi. 21-24, where it immediately follows the conversation with the messengers of John the Baptist. The condition of these Galilean towns lay so near the heart of our Lord as to force from Him more than once the words of warning. Here they have a peculiar significance, called forth by the remembrance of the inefficacy of previous ministrations.

16. *He that heareth.*] A similar, but more condensed, expression is found in Matt. x. 40, where with certain additions, it closes the charge to the Twelve. Nothing is more reasonable to suppose, than that Jesus closed both these addresses with the same, or very similar words, assuring each company of messengers that they were armed with Divine authority, and that those who received or rejected them would be regarded as having received or rejected their master, and even Him Whose messenger he was.

17. *And the seventy.*] The Evangelist, not here regarding the chronological order of events, passes at once to the return of the Seventy, with a report of their success. (Compare ch. ix. 10.) They came back in triumph. Not only had they healed the sick, according to the direction and authority given to them by their Master (verse 9), but "even the devils" had been cast out by them, when they were commanded by them "in the name" (compare ch. ix. 49) of Jesus. This was a success not unexpected by our Lord: though He had not expressly communicated to them this power, as to the Twelve: ch. ix. 1.

18. *I beheld Satan.*] Literally, "I was watching Satan like lightning fallen from heaven." The tense refers to the victories over the unclean spirits, just reported by the Seventy. While they were struggling successfully with those inferior ministers of the power of evil, Jesus in spirit (the same word in the original occurs Acts vii. 56), beheld the fall of the kingdom of darkness, typified by the fall of its head (compare John xii. 31; Rev. xii. 9), who is elsewhere called "the Prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii. 2) and is said, by his subordinates, to have authority "in high," *i.e.* heavenly, "places." (Eph. vi.

held Satan as lightning fall from heaven.

19 Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you.

20 Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven.

21 ¶ In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.

22 [1] All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father: and who the Father is, but the Son, and *he* to whom the Son will reveal *him*.

[1] Many ancient copies add these words, *And turning to his disciples, he said.*

23 ¶ And he turned him unto *his* disciples, and said privately, [c] Blessed *are* the eyes which see the things that ye see:

[c] Matt. 13. 16.

24 For I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen *them*; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard *them*.

---

12.) In these partial victories of His followers Jesus beheld a presage of the total fall of the kingdom of evil. Compare Rev. xii. 7-9.

*like lightning.*] For swiftness.

**19.** *power.*] Or, "**authority**." There is no doubt an allusion to Ps. xci. 13. But the use of the word "authority" seems to shew that the "serpents and scorpions" are not to be understood literally (as in Mark xvi. 18), but as emblems of the powers of evil. The preposition "over" depends, not on tread, but on authority. Jesus confirms to the Seventy the supernatural powers which they had recently exercised, and the first word of the sentence, "behold," indicates the surprise which this new announcement might be expected to excite. In fact it corresponds to the triumphant exclamation of the disciples recorded in verse 17.

**20.** *Notwithstanding in this.*] There is in this an obvious reference to the "joy" manifested by the Seventy (verse 17) on their return. They are warned that any amount of visible success in their master's service, is of far less importance than the sense of being His servants, and saved by Him. The word "rather," omitted by all the best MSS, is apparently an insertion, intended to soften down the (as it seemed) paradoxical prohibition against rejoicing in their victory over the powers of evil. With the closing words of the verse, compare Exod. xxxii. 32; Ps. lxix. 28; Philipp. iv. 3; Rev. xx. 12.

**21.** *In that hour.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. xi. 25-27, where these words (verses 21, 22) occur in a different context (immediately following those which are recited by St. Luke verses 13-15, where see notes), and are followed by the well-known and touching invitation, "Come unto me," &c., which is peculiar to St. Matthew. The passage certainly seems to be in its natural position here. Jesus had just told the Seventy disciples that He foresaw the destruction of Satan's kingdom, and that He regarded their success as an instalment and an emblem of it. He "rejoiced in spirit" on contemplating this ultimate triumph of good over evil, and praised the wisdom of His Father, who had chosen such weak instruments to perform so great a work.

*in spirit.*] Late editors adopt the reading of old MSS, and have "in the holy spirit."

**22.** *All things are.*] Properly, "**all things were delivered;**" by the eternal decree of God. The weight of MS authority, and of internal probability is possibly in favour of our inserting before this verse, "And turning to his disciples, He said" (as in the margin of the Authorised Version).

*will reveal.*] Or "**is willing to reveal.**"

**23.** *Blessed are the eyes.*] These words (verses 23, 24) are found in very nearly the same, though in a less wide and general, form in Matt. xiii. 16, 17; where see notes. They occur there in the answer to the question asked by the disciples after hearing the Parable of the Sower, "Why speakest thou unto them in parables" (Matt. xiii. 10). In both places they have special significance, nor should we doubt that they were twice spoken by our Lord.

25 ¶ And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, [d] Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?

[d] Matt. 22. 35.

26 He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou?

27 And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.

28 And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live.

---

25–37. The Question of the Lawyer, and the Parable of the Good Samaritan.

**25.** *And, behold, a certain lawyer.*] St. Luke, as usual, introduces this incident without note of time or place. The mention of the lawyer, however, makes it nearly certain that our Lord was then in Judæa; and this question was naturally asked by one of those who were watching Him. It was also, as appears from v. 38, on the way to Bethany, probably at no great distance; a circumstance which may to some extent account for the form of the great parable elicited by the lawyer's question. The contrast between the Samaritan and the representatives of Judaism, and the scenery of the Quarantana, which must have been just then traversed, would present themselves in vivid colours to the minds of the hearers; while the choice of a subject with local illustrations accords with frequent notices in the records of our Lord's teaching. In the three Synoptical Gospels there are no less than six narratives of similar questions being put to our Lord, and of conversations arising out of them. Three of them are clearly parallel to each other, and belong to a later period of our Saviour's ministry. They tell us of the rich young man,—a "ruler," as St. Luke informs us,—who asked Jesus what he should do to inherit eternal life, and who after professing to have kept all the commandments of the second Table, was unable to stand the higher test proposed to him. The history in the text is evidently distinct from this; if there could be otherwise any doubt about it, it is removed when we remember that both these histories are given by St. Luke (see Matt. xix. 16-22; Mark x. 17-22; ch. xviii. 18-23). Two more narratives are found in Matt. xxii. 34-40, and Mark xii. 28-34. They are certainly parallel, although the story is told more fully by St. Mark. They belong to a much later period of our Lord's ministry, even to the week before the Passion. The question is asked by a Pharisee, who was also a scribe or "lawyer," it is, "What is the great commandment in the Law?" The question is answered in terms as nearly as possible the same as those in which the lawyer, spoken of in the text, summarises the requirements of the Law. Nothing therefore can be more certain than that the history before us must be kept distinct from the other narratives which to a certain extent resemble it. Although the question put to our Lord by the lawyer is the same which we also read in ch. xviii. 18, it is certain that the Evangelist regarded the cases as different. The history has nothing in common with that which occurs in Matt. xxii. and Mark x., beyond the profession of the person who asks the question, and the definition of duty which is there given, and here elicited, by our Lord. It is necessary to have these facts before us in order to form a judgment on the originality of this passage.

*stood up.*] This seems to imply that Jesus and those who were with Him were sitting. There is nothing in this unsuitable to the notion of their being on a journey at the time. It may have taken place in a house in which Christ and His disciples rested by the way.

*tempted him.*] Testing Him; making trial of His skill in solving legal questions, and probably of His orthodoxy in interpreting the Law. The object of the lawyer was not practical, as in the case of the young man, or ruler, mentioned ch. xviii. 18, who seems really to have been in earnest up to a certain point. He wanted rather to exhibit his own dialectical skill, and to fence with this new Teacher. The answer of Jesus took him by surprise, and put him off his guard. His own weapons were turned against him, and instead of questioning, he was himself questioned. Then he replied by quoting the great summary of man's duty towards God in Deut. vi. 5 (which, it appears, was recited in the daily prayers of the Jews, see note on Mark xii. 29), and a statement of the law of love from Lev. xix. 18 (compare with the latter Rom. xii. 8-10; Jas. ii. 8). Jesus then brings the matter before His questioner in a practical way. The aim of the lawyer (as has been said) was not practical; but Jesus desired to shew him that such questions, if not raised with a view to practice, were worse than idle. The lawyer felt this home thrust. His conscience told him that his theory of conduct, excellent in itself, and approved by Him whose question had elicited it from him, had not been

29 But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour?

30 And Jesus answering said, A certain *man* went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded *him*, and departed, leaving *him* half dead.

31 And by chance there came down a certain priest that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side.

32 And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked *on him*, and passed by on the other side.

33 But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion *on him*,

34 And went to *him*, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him.

---

realised in his own life. Therefore he sought to turn away the application from himself by raising a distinction. "Who is my neighbour?" What are the limits of the obligation defined in the passage just quoted from the Law? Then follows the parable, the object of which is to shew that the law of love is not bounded by any limits save those of opportunity; and this is done by describing a great and spontaneous act of kindness performed by one who was as far as possible from being a "neighbour" to the recipient, in the sense in which the lawyer would of himself have understood that expression.

**30.** *answering.*] Quite literally, "Taking him up."

*A certain man.*] The question has been asked whether we are to regard the sufferer in the story as a Jew or as a Gentile. The real point of the parable requires us to accept the former alternative. For, although the religious difference between the Samaritans and any heathen people was really greater than that which divided Jews from Samaritans, yet, to a Jewish hearer, the latter interval would appear as much greater as the point of view was nearer: an act of kindness done by a Samaritan to a Jew would be much more startling than one done by a Samaritan to a heathen. Then, this supposition is necessary to give point and force to the contrast between the conduct of the Priest and Levite, and that of the Good Samaritan. The former neglected their countryman and co-religionist, because they knew nothing about him: the latter shewed mercy to a stranger, whom he regarded as a heretic.

*from Jerusalem to Jericho.*] The road passed through a wild district, of evil repute for robbers. "There we see the long descent of 3000 feet, by which the traveller 'went *down*' from Jerusalem on its high table-land to Jericho in the Jordan-valley. There the last traces of cultivation and habitation, after leaving Bethany, vanish away, and leave him in a wilderness as bare and as solitary as the Desert of Arabia. Up from the valley of the Jordan below, or from the caves in the overhanging mountains around him, issue the Bedouin robbers, who from a very early time gave this road a proverbial celebrity for its deeds of blood, and who now make it impossible for even the vast host of pilgrims to descend to the Jordan without a Turkish guard. Sharp turns of the road, projecting spurs of rock, everywhere facilitate the attack and escape of the plunderers. They seize upon the traveller and strip him, as is still the custom of their descendants in like case; they beat him severely, and leave him naked and bleeding under the fierce sun reflected from the white glaring mountains, to die, unless some unexpected aid arrives" (Stanley's 'Sinai and Palestine,' ch. xiii.).

*fell among thieves.*] Into the midst of them: so the original word implies.

*which stripped him.*] Rather, "**who having also stripped him, and beaten him, went away leaving him half dead.**"

**31.** *a certain priest.*] "Probably going to the great sacerdotal station in Jericho" (Stanley's 'Sinai and Palestine,' ch. xv.).

**33.** *But a certain Samaritan.*] The word "Samaritan" occupies an emphatic position in the original text, which places it in strong contrast with that which precedes. "The Samaritan, contemned by the Jews as half a heathen and idolater, stands opposed to the holy priest and Levite;" see note on v. 8.

*had compassion on him.*] "**Was moved with compassion.**"

**34.** *oil and wine.*] Cf. Isaiah i. 6; Mark vi. 13; and Plin. 'Hist. Nat.' xxxi. 17.

*an inn.*] A different word in the original from that which is thus translated in ch. ii. 7. That was a mere caravanserai, such as is still common in the East, in which travellers may find shelter, but neither food nor furniture.

35 And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two [1]pence, and gave *them* to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee.

[1] See Matt. 20.

36 Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?

37 And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. Then said Jesus unto him, Go, and do thou likewise.

38 ¶ Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house.

39 And she had a sister called

---

This, on the other hand, was an inn, in the ordinary sense of the word, with a host (verse 35) who provided the guests with food for payment.

**35.** *when he departed.*] "**When he had come out,**" *i.e.* of the house. The Samaritan was on the point of continuing his journey, and turned to the innkeeper, to provide for the future needs of the wounded man.

*two pence.*] Two denarii; see note on Matt. xx. 2. From that place it may be inferred that the sum was equivalent to two days' wages of an ordinary labourer. A small sum contrasted with the great kindness, but probably sufficient to defray expenses until the donor might return.

*when I come again.*] "**I myself** (the pronoun is emphatic) **will repay thee as I come back again.**"

**37.** *He that shewed.*] Quite literally "He that did the mercy with him," *i.e.* he that performed for him the act of mercy just recited.

*do thou likewise.*] Jesus concludes His teaching by shewing the lawyer that its purpose was practical. "Jesus opposes the action of the Samaritan to the idle casuistry of the Rabbins" (Godet). Patristic writers have dwelt much upon the mystical interpretation of this parable. A large number of such explanations will be found brought together in the 'Catena Aurea' of St. Thomas Aquinas, in Trench 'On the Parables' (xvii.), and (in a concentrated form) in Godet's 'Commentary on St. Luke.'

### 38–42. Martha and Mary.

**38.** *Now it came to pass.*] This short but deeply interesting anecdote is found only in St. Luke's Gospel. In John xi., xii. the names of the two sisters reappear. If there could otherwise be any doubt as to their identity, it would be removed by the similarity of position and character ascribed by St. John to each of the sisters. There, as here, it is Martha who serves, and Mary who expresses personal devotion to Christ (John xii. 2, 3). There, as here, the strong practical character of Martha shews itself: she goes forth to meet Jesus; while her tender-hearted sister sits mourning in the house (John xi. 20). If we consider the text by the light of John xi., xii., there can be no doubt that the village here spoken of is Bethany. It is clear from John xi. 1 that Martha and Mary were well-known persons. That passage presupposes in the reader a knowledge of their existence, although they are not previously mentioned in the Fourth Gospel. We have nothing to lead us to any safe conclusion as to the length of acquaintance or degree of intimacy between our Lord and the two sisters, at the period spoken of in the text. The absence of the name of Lazarus from St. Luke's narrative constitutes no difficulty. The real point of this short history is to contrast the conduct and character of the two sisters, and therefore the name of Lazarus may easily have dropped out from the oral or written sources of information made use of by St. Luke (Meyer). At the same time it is very conceivable that Lazarus may have been a merely temporary inmate of his sister's house at the time of his death. The manner in which the names of the brother and sisters are introduced by St. John (xi. 1, 2) rather suggests that this was so.

*he entered.*] "**He entered himself;**" *i. e.* alone, unaccompanied by His disciples (Meyer). This would suggest to us that the intimacy of Jesus with the sisters was already of some standing (against De Wette; see above); and it also shews that this entertainment is not to be confounded with that narrated by John xii. 1-8.

*Martha.*] An Aramaic name, signifying "Lady." It is clear from the text that Martha was the mistress of the house, and that Mary lived with her sister. In St. John's account also she takes the more prominent place. It is possible that she may have been either a married woman or a widow, but there is nothing to shew it. The description of the household given in John xi. certainly does not suit the supposition that Martha had a husband living; and the mention of her in John xii. 2 does not necessarily shew

Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word.

40 But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me.

41 And Jesus answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things:

42 But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.

## CHAPTER XI.

1 *Christ teacheth to pray, and that instantly:* 11 *assuring that God so will give us good things.* 14 *He, casting out a dumb devil, rebuketh the blasphemous Pharisees:* 28 *and sheweth who are blessed:* 29 *preacheth to the people,* 37 *and reprehendeth the outward shew of holiness in the Pharisees, scribes, and lawyers.*

AND it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples

---

that the "supper" there mentioned took place at her house.

39. *sat at Jesus' feet.*] Or, as we are probably to read, "**the Lord's feet.**" In the attitude of a learner, not during the entertainment, but while it was being prepared by the mistress of the house (De Wette, Meyer). Hence the complaint which follows.

40. *cumbered.*] "**Distracted:**" drawn this way and that by a multitude of things requiring her personal attention or supervision. The "much serving," or "manifold serving" as it might perhaps better be rendered, has respect to the contrast between the "many things" and the "one thing" which appears in our Lord's address (verses 41, 42). The characters of the two sisters here stand in marked antithesis. Both are devoted to Christ: each desires to serve Him and to do Him pleasure. But Martha is practical, anxious, and demonstrative; Mary gentle, retiring, quiet, and contemplative. The whole anecdote, if it were not a history, might be a parable. In fact its significance has been pressed to excess by the critics of a certain school, who see in it a conscious and direct exaltation of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith only over that of justification by the many works of the law.

42. *one thing is needful.*] One, and only one; for this is implied by the collocation of terms in the original text. There is a strong opposition here between the "many things" which were the subject of Martha's anxious care, the many acts of personal service which she desired to render to Christ, and the one thing which Mary did for Him, or sought from Him. Some have rendered it, not "one thing," but "one *person*," *i.e.* Jesus Himself. The antithesis would be weakened or destroyed by this translation. The "one thing" must be neuter as it stands over against the "many things" of the previous verse. It is, no doubt, "salvation—care for the soul." There is a remarkable weight of authority in favour of another reading: "But few things are needful, or one only" (א B L, and many ancient versions). There can, however, be no doubt that the reading arose from a misunderstanding; the text was interpreted as if Jesus had said "we only want one thing," *i.e.* only one kind of food, and then softened down by the insertion of "few or" &c. There is, however, this partial justification of the misinterpretation which gave rise to the various reading, that Jesus is no doubt speaking of food in the "one thing needful," but it is the food of the soul. This appears from the "good part," in which there may be an allusion to the portion of honour sent to the principal guests at a banquet.

*which.*] The form of the relative pronoun, which occurs in the original, generalises the sense. The passage might be rendered "the good portion, a portion which shall not be taken away from her."

In the supplemental Note on ix. 51, it has been pointed out that our Lord was in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, and that in all probability He then visited the city as we find recorded in John x. 22, *seq.*

CHAP. XI.—1-13. THE LORD'S PRAYER.

1. *And it came to pass.*] Of the following passage (verses 1-13), in which our Lord gives instruction concerning prayer, the introductory portion (verse 1) occurs in this place alone, the Lord's Prayer in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 9-13), the parable (verses 5-8) is peculiar to St. Luke, while the concluding exhortations (verses 9-13) are found also in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 7-11). Neither the Lord's Prayer, nor the exhortations to persistency in prayer, are read in St. Luke's "Sermon on

said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.

2 And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, [f]Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.

[f] Matt. 6. 9.

3 Give us [1]day by day our daily bread.

[1] Or, *for the day*.

4 And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

5 And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three loaves;

6 For a friend of mine [1]in his journey is come to me, and I have nothing to set before him?

[1] Or, *out of his way*.

7 And he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee.

8 I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will rise and give him as many as he needeth.

---

the Plain" (ch. vi. 20-49). This accord-with St. Luke's custom of avoiding repetition. The last verses of this passage, those which follow the parable, may very easily have been spoken twice. Nothing again is more conceivable than that the Lord's Prayer may have been delivered by Christ to His disciples more than once, especially if it was intended by Him as a form, and not merely as a pattern, of prayer. There may have been, and probably were, special reasons why it should have been delivered a second time, in answer to a request preferred to Him by one of the new disciples, who came to Him in a part of the country where He had not previously been teaching; more especially if, as seems highly probable, we are to connect this notice with that in John xi. 40-42; from which we learn that after our Lord's visit to Jerusalem He went away beyond the Jordan to the place where John had at first baptized, and that there He made many disciples, who would be specially interested in the inquiry into the difference between our Saviour and the Baptists. The coincidence indeed can scarcely be fortuitous: it suggests a clear and very satisfactory solution of the difficulty here felt by most critics. See the additional Note on ch. ix. 51.

*in a certain place.*] Probably the place where John first baptized; see previous note.

*John also.*] The example of John is appealed to in the matter of fasting also (ch. v. 33). We may infer from this and from what follows that the teaching here referred to was the communication of some definite form of prayer to be recited periodically, according to the custom of the Jews. Our Lord answers the request by giving a form of prayer; but by the parable and exhortations which follow He teaches that earnestness and constancy in prayer is more important than the particular form of words used.

2. *When ye pray, say.*] Perhaps "**whensoever ye pray say.**" At all events these words prove that the Lord's Prayer was delivered as a form to be used, and not merely as a petition to be followed (against Godet, who evades the obvious force of these words). "'The peculiar and abridged form in Luke,' says Meyer, 'is a proof that the apostolic church did not use the Lord's Prayer as a form.' Rather, we may say, a proof of the fidelity with which our Evangelist reproduced his original reports, not correcting them to suit the forms most probably in use. If the apostolic church did not use the Lord's Prayer as a form, *when did its use begin*, which we find in every known liturgy"? (Alford).

On the readings of the Lord's Prayer see Notes at the end of the chapter.

5. *Which of you.*] The teaching of the parable is obvious; it is the same as that of the very similar parable which occurs in ch. xviii. 1-8. And both in the parable before us, in that now referred to, and in the Parable of the Unjust Steward (ch. xvi. 1-8) the difficulty occurs that the actor in the narrative, who represents (so to speak) Almighty God, is introduced as being influenced by unworthy motives, or approving of unworthy conduct. The answer lies simply in this, that every member of the similitude is not ordinarily to be pressed, in interpreting our Lord's parables. The lesson of this and of the parallel story in ch. xviii. is simply this, "that men ought always to pray and not to faint" (ch. xviii. 1). The construction of this sentence is peculiar. It commences with a question, but shortly passes off into narrative: compare verse 11; ch. xv. 4, 8.

8. *importunity.*] Or "**Shamelessness.**"

f Matt. 7. 7.

9 f And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.

10 For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

g Matt. 7. 9.

11 g If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if *he ask* a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent?

12 Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion?

13 If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall *your* heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

14 ¶ And he was casting out a devil, and it was dumb. And it came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb spake; and the people wondered.

15 But some of them said, a He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils.

a Matt. 12. 24.

16 And others, tempting *him*, sought of him a sign from heaven.

17 But he, knowing their thoughts,

---

**9.** *And I say.*] The pronoun "I" is emphatic. It marks the close connexion between the foregoing parable and the teaching founded upon it. Whether or not these sentences are in place in Matt. vii. 7-11, (where see notes) they are surely rightly placed here.

**11.** *If a son.*] Rather, "**But of which of you that is his father, shall his son ask bread? will he give him a stone? if a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? or if also he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?**" With the construction compare (and see note on) verse 5.

**12.** *Or if he shall.*] This addition is peculiar to St. Luke. There is a resemblance between the form of an egg and that of a scorpion, as between a fish and a serpent.

**13.** *the Holy Spirit.*] Which is the best gift of all: Matthew (vii. 11) says simply "good things."

### 14–27. The Charge of Demoniacal Agency.

**14.** *And he was casting.*] This is one of the strongest cases in which St. Luke's account of transactions in Peræa agrees so closely with others recorded in Galilee as to give an impression of absolute identity. It must, however, be remarked that with regard to the miracle there is a difference between this and that recorded by St. Matthew, which St. Luke, a careful relater of cases of healing, would not naturally have passed over had he referred to the same event. The man in St. Matthew was both blind and dumb; here he is dumb only. That similar remarks on the two healings should have been by captious witnesses is surely not improbable: the cavil, first raised in the early part of our Lord's ministration, was one upon which great stress was afterwards laid by His opponents, and constituted, in fact, a stock argument with them, to which frequent reference is made by early Christian apologists. The striking similarity of expression may, however, be to some extent owing to the natural tendencies of oral tradition in transmitting accounts of similar transactions. With regard to the correspondence with St. Mark, iii. 22-30, it is further noticeable that the second Evangelist introduces the cavil and the answer at a different time and in reference to a different transaction. St. Luke, as most critics agree, had St. Mark's Gospel before him, but not that of St. Matthew. It is impossible that he could have combined their accounts, at the same time introducing very serious alterations. The occasion here was one especially adapted to elicit an important doctrine which our Evangelist, as elsewhere, careful to avoid repetitions, had not previously recorded. Compare throughout the tenour of the objections raised by the Jews in John x. 20. Their emissaries were at this time actively engaged in opposing our Lord.

**15.** *some of them.*] Matthew (xii. 24) says, "the Pharisees;" Mark (iii. 22) "the scribes which came down from Jerusalem." On this occasion the same persons would naturally come forward.

*through Beelzebub.*] Literally "**in Beelzebub:**" in the strength of the demon, by whom (as appears from Mark iii. 22) they believed, or affected to believe, Him to be possessed.

**16.** *And others, tempting him.*] "Certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees," according to Matt. xii. 38, where this demand is placed, not as in the text, but immediately before the discourse to which it gave rise, and which appears below (verses 29-32) after the exclamation of the woman and our Lord's reply.

said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and a house *divided* against a house falleth.

18 If Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye say that I cast out devils through Beelzebub.

19 And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast *them* out? therefore shall they be your judges.

20 But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you.

21 When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace:

22 But when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils.

23 He that is not with me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.

24 [b] When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out.

[b] Matt. 12. 43.

25 And when he cometh, he findeth *it* swept and garnished.

26 Then goeth he, and taketh *to him* seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last *state* of that man is worse than the first.

27 ¶ And it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman

---

The demand for a sign is given by Mark in a wholly different place (Mark viii. 11, 12).

**17.** *a house divided.*] So, there can be no reasonable doubt, the passage ought to be translated, and that, as De Wette shews, not merely on account of the parallels in Matthew and Mark, but from the general drift and symmetry of the passage itself.

**20.** *with the finger of God.*] Matthew (xii. 28) has "by the Spirit of God," which practically means the same thing. With the phrase in the text compare Exod. viii. 19, to which there is apparently an allusion. It is implied that there is the same opposition between the power by which Jesus cast out the unclean spirits, and that by which His opponents said that He cast them out, as that which subsisted between the miraculous powers entrusted to Moses, and the powers wielded by the Egyptian magicians.

**21.** *When a strong man.*] Literally, "**when the strong man**" and so below, "**but when the stronger,**" or, "**he that is stronger than he.**" Compare and see note on Matt. xii. 29, where the matter is substantially the same. There, however, it is put in the form of an argumentative question; here it is thrown into a short parable.

**23.** *He that is.*] This also appears in the same position in Matt. xii. 30, where see note on the connexion of ideas. It is altogether absent from St. Mark's report of this discourse.

**24.** *When the unclean.*] This passage (verses 24-26) also appears in St. Matthew's report of this conversation, although it is there assigned to the second portion of it, that concerning the request for a sign from heaven. It does not appear in St. Mark's Gospel at all. In St. Matthew it closes the whole discourse, as here it closes the first section of it; and it is there immediately followed by the interruption caused by some one who told Jesus that His mother and brethren stood without, as here by the ascription of blessedness to His mother. In each case the interruption is said to have occurred while He was speaking to the people. We may, therefore, be certain that His speech was broken off at this point, possibly to be resumed afterwards (on this passage, and on the connexion of thought, see notes on Matt. xii. 43-45). SS. Matthew and Mark have in this place the saying concerning blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (see ch. xiii. 10), which is followed in St. Matthew by expressions of a proverbial character, some of which appear also in ch. vi. 43-45 in a different form and connexion. There can be no doubt that our Lord repeated such proverbial sayings on various occasions, and in somewhat varying senses.

**26.** *worse than the first.*] St. Matthew adds, (xii. 45) "Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation."

**27.** *And it came to pass.*] This incident (verses 27, 28) is peculiar to St. Luke, but it takes the place of a somewhat similar incident, eliciting a very similar reflexion which appears in the parallels Matt. xii. 46-50; Mark iii. 31-35. See note on verse 14.

of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed *is* the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked.

28 But he said, Yea rather, blessed *are* they that hear the word of God, and keep it.

c Matt. 12. 38.

29 ¶ [c] And when the people were gathered thick together, he began to say, This is an evil generation: they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet.

30 For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation.

31 The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon *is* here.

32 The men of Nineve shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas *is* here.

33 [d] No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth *it* in a secret place, neither under a [1] bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light.

d Matt. 5. 15.

1 See Matt. 5. 15.

34 [e] The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light;

e Matt. 6. 22.

---

*of the company.*] Or, "**out of the crowd.**"

29. *were gathered thick.*] Or, "**were gathering thick.**" This statement accords exactly with St. John's account of the impression made by our Lord's words and works in Peræa (see above, p. 380). There is no reason to doubt the independence of the following sayings, although, as usual, they have counterparts on other occasions recorded by the first two Evangelists: see marginal references. Here St. Luke probably gives a few notices selected from a long discourse then delivered to the new disciples in Peræa.

*the prophet.*] There is strong evidence against the genuineness of these words, though they are found in A C and other MSS and ancient Versions. They were probably added to bring the text into harmony with the parallel passage in St. Matthew.

31. *a greater.*] Or, "**somewhat greater.**" So also in the next verse.

33. *No man.*] This saying occurs in a different connexion in the Sermon on the Mount. (Matt. v. 15.) But as it also occurs in this Gospel (ch. viii. 16; compare Mark iv. 21) in connexion with the Parable of the Sower, there can be no doubt that it was one of those proverbial phrases which were repeated by our Lord on various occasions. We may therefore conclude that the same is true of the remainder of this discourse (verses 34-36) which appears also, though in a somewhat condensed form, in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 22, 23: see the notes on the passages in Matthew). The question is, then, of the connexion in this place. The following explanation appears to be, on the whole, the simplest and most satisfactory. Jesus had been assailed by His enemies, both with the charge of performing mighty works by the aid of the powers of evil, and with a clamour for a sign from heaven to prove the celestial source of His mission and of the miraculous powers which seemed to authenticate it. These two points, which are more or less separated by St. Matthew, are brought close together by St. Luke (verses 15, 16). Jesus answers, in effect, "The sign for which you ask will be given. Jonas was a sign to the Ninevites, and so shall the Son of Man be a sign to this generation." The sign shall be open, public, capable of being read of all men. This is part of the very nature of a sign: no man, when he has lighted a candle, conceals it: that is no sign, which is not seen. But in order that the sign may have its effect on the minds of those to whom it is given, in order that it may convince,—those minds must be in a healthy and unbiassed condition. The light which is given alike to all, can only profit those whose power of vision is healthy and natural (verses 34-36); and those only whose hearts are free from prejudice can appreciate the spiritual light which God has afforded to them. Those who saw in the mighty works of Jesus an exhibition of the power of the Evil one would not be likely to recognise the sign from heaven for which they, or others like-minded with them, were now asking.

*secret place.*] Or, as we ought to read, "**in a crypt**" or, "**covered way.**"

but when *thine eye* is evil, thy body also *is* full of arkness.

35 Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness.

36 If thy whole body therefore *be* full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light.

37 ¶ And as he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him: and he went in, and sat down to meat.

38 And when the Pharisee saw *it*, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner.

39 *f* And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness.

*f* Matt. 23. 25.

40 *Ye* fools, did not he that made

---

**36.** *If thy whole.*] This addition is peculiar to St. Luke. The appearance of tautology is removed by placing the emphasis, in the first clause upon the word "whole" (of which the subsidiary clause "having no part dark" is a further explanation), and in the third clause, not upon "whole" but upon "full of light, as when" or which is to be treated as a single predicate of the whole body. (Meyer, Oosterzee, Godet.) "Therefore" in the first clause, recalls us to the assertion, "thy whole body also is full of light," verse 34. The whole verse may thus be paraphrased: "It has been said (verse 34) that if the eye is single (simple, healthy) the whole body is full of light. If, therefore, in that case, the *whole* body is so full of light as to have no part left unenlightened, then it will be all as full of light as when," &c. The teaching of the passage apparently points to the gradual growth in purity and holiness which tends to overcome and expel every remaining prejudice and hindrance to the reception of Divine truth, until the whole man, in heart and life alike, has become subject to it.

37–54. THE DENUNCIATION OF THE PHARISEES.

**37.** *And as he spake.*] The circumstances here narrated by St. Luke accord very strikingly with what is known of the feelings of the dominant party at the time. The formal decision to destroy our Lord had not yet been declared; see John xi. 53. The Pharisees and Scribes, however, were fully aware of the intentions of the Sanhedrim, and were anxiously watching for grounds of formal complaint. To invite them to partake of an ordinary meal was an intelligible proceeding; but our Lord took that opportunity of exposing the shallowness of their pretences, and delivered a discourse with denunciations, which shewed that the followers must be prepared for a final breach. The similarity of these denunciations with those recorded by St. Matthew will be variously accounted for accordingly as commentators regard them as derived from a common source or as taken from the other Evangelist. St. Matthew may have, as seems probable, combined sayings uttered on different occasions in one discourse: there is certainly no reason to suppose that they were not uttered on this occasion, as we find them related by St. Luke, who, at the end of this chapter, is careful to state the effect which they produced on our Lord's opponents.

*to dine.*] Really "**to breakfast**;" the first meal of the day. We read, in the remainder of the verse, that "He went in and sat down." Properly, "having entered in, He sat down:" *i.e.* He sat down to the table as soon as He had gone in, without any preparatory ceremony of purification.

**39.** *Now.*] *I.e.* apparently, "as things are,"—"as a matter of fact."

*make clean, &c.*] Compare and see note on Matt. xxiii. 25. There is, however, a remarkable difference of expression here. In Matthew, the inward part of the cup and platter, here "your inward part" is full of "extortion" or "ravening" (the same word in the original), and excesses, or wickedness. The words as given by Matthew mean that however much the Pharisees cleansed (on grounds of religion) the outside of their vessels, their contents were obtained by extortion and used profligately. The inward part, in St. Luke's recital, refers to the mental and spiritual condition of the persons addressed. In order to bring this passage into harmony with St. Matthew, Beza translates, "But that which is within is full of your extortion and wickedness." He is followed in this by Kuinöl and Bleek. This, however, is, to say the least, a forced rendering: it does violence to the words.

**40.** *Ye fools, did.*] This verse is peculiar to St. Luke. The parallel (so far as it can truly be called a parallel) Matt. xxiii. 26, speaks only of "that which is within," and "the outside of," "the cup and platter." In

that which is without make that which is within also?

41 But rather give alms [1]of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.

[1] Or, *as you are able.*

42 But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

43 [g]Woe unto you, Pharisees!

[g] Matt. 23. 6.

---

Luke, as we have just seen, our Lord passes at once from the consideration of the outside of the cup and the platter, to the contrast between that which is external and that which is inward in spiritual things. The meaning of the clause, therefore, is simply this: the same God hath made both that which is within and that which is without, the things of the spirit as well as the things of the body. Obedience to Him demands purity in the former as well as in the latter. They are "fools," who act upon strict rules to avoid external defilement, while they allow their inward parts to be defiled by all manner of wickedness. So it is taken by Meyer, Godet, and Oosterzee. Luther translates, for He who hath made clean that which is without hath not (therefore) made clean that which is within also. But this translation puts a force upon the words. The rendering of our Authorised Version, explained as above, appears to be the simplest and best, and most aptly to suit the context. It must be observed that three uncial MSS invert the relative position of "that which is without" and "that which is within." The confusion probably arose from a misunderstanding of the passage.

41. *But rather give alms.*] Translate, "**But rather give the things that are in them in alms, and behold all things are clean for you.**" The word translated "of such things as ye have" (*i.e.* according to your ability) certainly means "the things that are in them," *i.e.* in the cup and the platter. The command is to give away in charity what was gathered by covetousness or unfair dealing, and spent in a selfish manner. In the previous verse the opposition between that "which is without" and "that which is within" represents, as we have seen, the contrast between the outward and visible and the inward and spiritual. There is now an abrupt transition to that which is (locally) within the cup and the platter, and it is for this very reason, as Godet shews, that a different term is here employed in the original. So it is taken by Kuinöl, De Wette, Bleek, Meyer. Certain expositors have seen in this passage, taken according to its most obvious meaning, a sentiment unfavourable to the Pauline doctrine of Justification. They have therefore endeavoured to give it an ironical meaning. "Give in alms the things that are therein, and, behold all things are clean in your opinion." As if Jesus had said, "To what purpose is it to rebuke your want of inward purity? I know that, in your opinion, you have but to give a little of your ill-gotten or misapplied goods in alms, and everything is purified by that." (So Erasmus, Kuinöl, Stier, Oosterzee, and others.) But to say nothing of other objections to this interpretation, the passage, so understood, would be strangely out of place here. The Pharisees are rebuked for formalism and ceremonies, for covetousness and extortion, but not for any hypocritical system of almsgiving. There is nothing here to teach us that sin is cleansed or put away by any outward action. Take the whole passage together, and its meaning is very simple. The Pharisees strove after outward and ceremonial purity, while they neglected the purity of the spirit. Now what is it which defiles the spirit? It is selfishness, whether manifesting itself in "extortion," or in "excess" (Matt. xxiii. 25). Let them do one single loving, unselfish act—not for the sake of the action itself, nor for any merit inherent in it—but out of pure good will towards others, and their whole inward condition would be different. Let those things which had been the materials and instruments of sin and selfishness become the instruments of love and kindness, and all things, both that which is without and that which is within, would be at once purified for them. In other words as the cup and platter, the outside of which they cleansed so scrupulously and sedulously, were defiled by the bad means by which their contents were procured, or the evil uses to which they were put, so they would be purified, not by any formal outward acts, but by that spirit of love which would dictate a right and charitable destination of their contents.

42. *But woe unto you.*] Compare and see note on Matt. xxiii. 23, where for "rue and all manner of herbs" we find "anise and cummin;" and instead of "judgment and the love of God," we have "judgment, mercy and faith," with an apparent allusion to Mic. vi. 8. The lesson is in either place the same. The Pharisees are not directly censured for a scrupulous observance of the minutiæ of the Law, but for not observing a due proportion between its great eternal principles and its minor requirements. Practically, the lesson is the same as that of verses

for ye love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets.

44 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over *them* are not aware *of them*.

45 ¶ Then answered one of the lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also.

46 [h]And he said, Woe unto you also, *ye* lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.

[h] Matt. 23. 4.

47 [i]Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them.

[i] Matt. 23. 29.

48 Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres.

49 Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and *some* of them they shall slay and persecute:

50 That the blood of all the pro-

---

39-41, the substance of which agrees with the parallel denunciation to this in Matt. xxiii.

**43.** *for ye love.*] Compare and see note on Matt. xxiii. 6, 7.

**44.** *scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!*] These words are wanting in א B C L and many MSS and versions (although they occur in A D) and are accordingly omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles, and marked as doubtful by Lachmann. They seem to have found their way into the text from the parallel, Matt. xxiii. 27. There is a certain difference between the comparison in this verse and that in the similar passage of Matthew. There, the sepulchres are "whited" and outwardly beautiful; here, they are simply unseen, so that men are legally defiled by treading on them unawares.

**45.** *one of the lawyers.*] See ch. x. 25. The leaning of the lawyers would generally be to the Pharisaic party. We have in Matt. xxii. 35 a direct example of a lawyer who belonged to that party. It has been inferred from the words of the lawyer in this verse, that he was not strictly speaking a Pharisee, and even that he was a Sadducee. The latter supposition is negatived both by the company in which he is found, and by the reproaches directed by Jesus against the lawyers, some of which would not have been at all applicable to the Sadducees. There can be little doubt, however, that the lawyer was a Pharisee (Meyer, Oosterzee). The words of which he makes use do not in any way disprove it. He means that the reproaches which had been directed against the party, also touched the *profession* to which he belonged. Godet observes that, in our Lord's reply, a threefold woe is denounced against the lawyers (verses 46, 47, 52) as before against the Pharisees (verses 42, 43, 44).

**46.** *for ye lade men.*] Compare and see note on Matt. xxiii. 4. The reproach is, however, more especially applicable to the lawyers. The Pharisees, as a party, did observe this burdensome ceremonial: verse 42.

**47.** *for ye build.*] The expression is more condensed than in the similar passage, Matt. xxiii. 29.

**48.** *Truly ye bear.*] Or rather, according to the reading of א B L adopted by Tischendorf and Tregelles (the received reading being apparently transferred from Matt. xxiii. 41) "**Therefore ye be witnesses**" (*i.e.* ye give favourable testimony) "**unto, and approve the deeds of your fathers; because they,**" &c. In St. Matthew's recital they are said to bear witness to themselves "that ye are the children," (*i.e.* genuine children: compare ch. vi. 35) "of them which killed the prophets."

*their sepulchres.*] These two words are marked as doubtful by Lachmann, and omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles, after א B D L, all other MSS and nearly all ancient Versions have them. They must in any case be understood, and may possibly have been supplied in order to get rid of the harsh construction. This verse does not appear in Matt. xxiii.; where, however, there is another severe denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 32, 33) before we come to the parallel passage to the next verse.

**49.** *I will send them.*] This passage, which appears here in the form of a quotation, is not so introduced in Matt. xxiii. 34–36, where, however, the passage itself is substantially the same. For "apostles" (*i.e.* missionaries or emissaries: the word is etymologically connected with the verb translated "I will send," so that we need not suspect the accuracy of St. Luke's report on account of it) Matthew has "wise men and scribes;"

phets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation;

51 [k]From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation.

[k] Gen. 4. 8.

52 [l]Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye [1]hindered.

[l] Matt. 23. 13.

[1] Or, *forbad.*

53 And as he said these things unto them, the scribes and the Pharisees began to urge *him* vehemently, and to provoke him to speak of many things:

54 Laying wait for him, and seeking to catch something out of his mouth, that they might accuse him.

---

instead of simply "slay and persecute," Matthew specifies certain forms of death and persecution: for "the blood of all the prophets" (verse 50) Matthew has "all the righteous blood;" and to the name "Zacharias" he adds, "the son of Barachias" (see note on Matt. xxiii. 35). The difficulty to be considered here lies in the introductory words of verse 49. The difficulty is of a twofold nature: first, the words here ascribed to "the wisdom of God" (whatever we are to understand by that expression) are there the words of our Lord Himself; secondly, if these words are introduced in this place as a quotation, they are nowhere found in the Old Testament. Various solutions of these difficulties have been proposed. Ewald, Bleek, and others suppose that it may be a quotation from a lost book bearing the title of the Wisdom of God (but no such book is known to have existed) or, as Paulus thinks, in which Wisdom personified is introduced as speaking. Meyer points out that this is against the analogy of our Lord's quotations, since they are never taken from apocryphal books. He also notices that the words are recited as something spoken beforehand ("Therefore also *said*," &c.) and infers that our Lord is here quoting His own previous saying, as the words of the wisdom of God speaking by Him. But there is no evidence that such words had been previously spoken: as recited by St. Matthew, they belong to a later period of our Lord's ministry. Olshausen, Stier, and Alford see in the passage a virtual quotation from 2 Chron. xxiv. 19–22. Let us rather say that there is in the words here ascribed to the wisdom of God a reference to the whole of that passage, not merely (as is obvious) to the historical fact which it records; and that the wisdom of God is here represented as promising to do that which God is recorded to have done in the passage referred to; and we shall probably be right in accepting the interpretation thus modified. On comparing this text with the similar one in Matt. xxiii. 34–36, Meyer observes that "the originality is not on the side of Luke." On the contrary, it appears as though this Evangelist repeated very closely and minutely the words of the original discourse. The bare existence of the difficulty which we have been engaged in considering points to that conclusion. It is really almost impossible to understand how it should have been inserted into the body of our Lord's speech if it was not there originally: its very hardness forbids the supposition.

52. *ye have taken away.*] Compare, and see note on Matt. xxiii. 13, which is not, however, in all respects parallel. There, the Scribes and Pharisees shut up the kingdom of heaven; here (by a remarkably vigorous metaphor) the lawyers are accused of having taken away the key of knowledge. The knowledge here spoken of is not that of Christian doctrine (Kuinöl, Oosterzee), nor that of saving truth (Meyer), nor, directly, that of salvation (De Wette, Bleek), but the true and living knowledge of God, of which the Scriptures were the key. The Scribes, by arrogating to themselves exclusive authority to interpret the Scriptures, while they did not interpret them truly, either for their own use, or for the good of those whom they instructed, kept the key of knowledge shut up and useless.

*were entering in.*] *I.e.* "were endeavouring to enter."

53. *And as he said these things unto them.*] Substitute, "**And when he was gone out from thence.**" "**Laying wait for him**" (א omits "for him") "**to catch something out of his mouth.**" The whole text is confused at this point.

*provoke him.*] Or perhaps, "**question him.**"

## ADDITIONAL NOTES on verses 2, 3 and 4.

2. *Our Father which art in heaven.*] Two uncial MSS, ℵ and B, have "Father" only. Origen supports this reading, tom. i. pp. 226, 232; yet recognises the missing words in another passage, i. 222. L, which generally agrees with B, has "Our Father." All other uncials, including three, A, C, D, whose combined authority balances ℵ, B, present the clause as it stands in our Version. So, too, all the ancient Versions, with the exception of the Vulgate (and that not in all MSS), follow the two MSS, on the ground that the text of St. Luke was probably altered to bring it into accordance with St. Matthew. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that the only MSS which omit the words are conspicuous for omissions, and that the accord of A with L, D, and the Oriental Versions, is very rarely found in disputed texts.

*Thy kingdom.*] For these words two of the Fathers, Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus, read "Thy Holy Spirit." There can be no question as to the true reading, but the fact is noticeable, both as shewing the proneness of some Fathers to admit variations, and as indicating the true interpretation.

*Thy will be done.*] This clause also is omitted by late editors on the authority of one old MS, B, supported, as usual, by L, and of Origen. The Sinaitic codex retains it. The possibility that it was taken from St. Matthew's Gospel may justify doubt, but can scarcely authorise excision.

3. *our daily bread.*] See note on St. Matthew. Late critics are divided between our "bread for the coming day," best defended by Professor Lightfoot; "our sufficient of bread;" and "our spiritual bread," for which McClellan adduces authorities, which is also adopted by a rationalistic critic, A. Thoma, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift f. w. T. 1874, p. 339. A reference to the mystical signification of "bread" can scarcely be questioned in the twice-repeated miracle of feeding: it pervades the discourses in the Gospel of St. John, ch. vi. 26–59, and from that time must have been present to the consciousness of our Lord's disciples. The rendering "sufficient," which is supported by strong authorities ancient (cf. Cyril on Luke, p. 265) and modern, does not exclude such reference.

4. *our sins.*] St. Matthew has "our debts," a Hebrew idiom for "sins."

*for we also forgive every.*] This is slightly stronger than the corresponding petition in St. Matthew. Both, however, imply that the disciples by whom the prayer was to be offered would fully recognise the condition of acceptance. The forgiveness or remission of debt applies to debtors unable to discharge their obligations, not to those who seek to evade just payments.

*but deliver us from evil.*] Late editors omit these words, following the same authorities as in the first clause of the prayer.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

1 *Christ preacheth to his disciples to avoid hypocrisy, and fearfulness in publishing his doctrine:* 13 *warneth the people to beware of covetousness, by the parable of the rich man who set up greater barns.* 22 *We must not be over careful of earthly things,* 31 *but seek the kingdom of God,* 33 *give alms,* 36 *be ready at a knock to open to our Lord whensoever he cometh.* 41 *Christ's ministers are to see to their charge,* 49 *and look for persecution.* 54 *The people must take this time of grace,* 58 *because it is a fearful thing to die without reconciliation.*

IN [m] the mean time, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, inso-

[m] Matt. 16. 6.

---

CHAP. XII.—1-3. WARNINGS AGAINST HYPOCRISY.

1. *An innumerable multitude of people.*] Literally "the ten thousands of the multitude." This implies a continuance. The multitude which had been previously drawn together, began again to crowd around Him, as He went forth from the house of the Pharisee. The discourse which follows (verses 1-12) stands in close connexion with the foregoing, and must be understood to have been delivered very shortly after it. It contains sayings which were also made use of on other occasions, and which will be noticed as they occur. But it cannot be regarded as a mere compilation: on the contrary it falls very naturally into the place in which we find it. By His recent outspoken attack on the Scribes and Pharisees (ch. xi. 39-52) Jesus had provoked their animosity to the utmost (ch. xi. 53, 54). He takes the

much that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.

[a] Matt. 10. 26.

2 [a]For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known.

3 Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the house-tops.

[b] Matt. 10. 28.

4 [b]And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do.

5 But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him.

---

opportunity of warning His disciples against hypocrisy and encouraging them to freedom of speech (verses 1-3), in opposition to the conduct of the Pharisees who had tried to get up grounds of accusation against Him by indirect means (ch. xi. 53, 54): He bids them to be bold in their Master's service (verses 4, 5) assuring them of the Divine protection (verses 6, 7, 11, 12), and warning them against denying or being ashamed of their Master's cause (verses 8, 9), and in connexion with this point He speaks of the fearful sin of ascribing God's work to the powers of evil (verse 10).

*began to say.*] The words mark the opening of a great discourse, delivered especially to the disciples in the presence of the crowd, which is thus marked off from the severe denunciation which had just been uttered in the house of the Pharisee.

*first of all.*] This is connected with the following warning in the sense of "above every thing," by Meyer, De Wette, Godet, Olshausen, and Oosterzee. It is more probably to be connected with the foregoing words, as in the Authorised Version. A distinction is drawn between the speech to the disciples, and that to the multitude which follows. (So Bengel.)

*Beware ye.*] Compare, and see note on, the similar warning in Matt. xvi. 6, 12. There it was suggested by an incident on the way: here it is repeated with peculiar fitness in connexion with the notices at the end of the preceding chapter.

*hypocrisy.*] In interpreting the Scriptural use of the words "hypocrite," "hypocrisy," it is well to remember their etymology. The hypocrite is the man who has to play a part, to maintain a reputation, to keep up a respectable position, to act consistently with the conventional maxims of the party with which he is allied, or the profession to which he belongs. This leaven, *i.e.* this subtle tendency to evil, would especially work in a party such as the sect of the Pharisees, the maintainers of scrupulous and decorous orthodoxy. They would, almost unconsciously, put a face on things, and conceal their real sentiments, for the sake of custom, decency, or expediency. It is against this tendency that the disciples are warned in this and the following verses.

2. *For there is.*] The following passage (verses 2-9) occurs, in nearly the same form, in the charge to the Twelve, Matt. x. 26-33, where see notes. There are, however, some marked differences between the passage now referred to, and that before us. In Matt. x. 27 the Apostles are commanded to recite aloud and publicly the instructions which they have received from their Master in secret. Here they are told, that their own secret words and sayings will be made public and open. So true was it that all things would be made known, even those things which the Pharisees most studiously concealed under the mask of hypocrisy, that the disciples themselves, should they convey any instruction privately or secretly, would sooner or later be surprised to find how it had been made publicly known. Meyer, in answer to De Wette, notes it as marking a later stage on our Lord's teaching: see too Hilgenfeld, 'Einl.' p. 564.

3. *in closets.*] "In the store rooms:" the most secret part of the house. Compare Matt. vi. 6; xxiv. 26; where the same word is used in the original.

*upon the house-tops.*] "These sayings have a strong Syrian colouring. The Syrian house-top (in Matt. x. 27; Luke xii. 3), presents an image which has no sense in Asia Minor, or Greece, or Italy, or even at Antioch. The flat roofs cease at the mouth of the Orontes: Antioch itself has inclined roofs;" Renan, 'Les Évangiles,' p. 262, note 1.

4-12. WARNING AGAINST FEARFULNESS.

This warning comes naturally after the notice of bitter enmity on the part of the dominant sect.

6 Are not five sparrows sold for two [1]farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God?

See Matt. 10. 29.

7 But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows.

8 [c] Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God:

c Matt. 10. 32. 2 Tim. 2. 12.

9 But he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God.

10 And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven.

11 [d] And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and *unto* magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say:

d Matt. 10. 19.

12 For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.

---

6. *five sparrows.*] Compare and see note on Matt. x. 29.

8. *before the angels of God.*] In the similar passage (Matt. x. 32, 33) it is "before my Father which is in heaven." Here then is a distinct allusion to the Great Judgment by the Son of Man, at which the angels are regularly represented as present.

10. *And whosoever shall.*] Compare and see note on Matt. xii. 31, 32, where (as also in Matt. iii. 25-30) the same saying occurs in answer and with reference to the charge of having cast out devils through Beelzebub. In the parallel passage of this Gospel to those just referred to (ch. xi. 17-36) the saying is wanting, St. Luke as usual omitting on one occasion what he records in connexion with another. It must be remembered that the charge of casting out devils through Beelzebub, which (according to both Matthew and Mark) elicited this condemnation, was the first occasion of an open rupture between our Lord and the Pharisees. This must have been fresh in His mind, when this warning speech was delivered to the disciples, and it is not wonderful that He should repeat a saying in which He had already denounced the conduct of His adversaries. The saying is peculiarly suitable to this place. The disciples are warned against hypocrisy, and encouraged to boldness of action and freedom of speech. They are warned not to be ashamed of their Master, not to deny Him before men. And yet they are also warned that there is a more terrible fall than that. A word might be spoken against Jesus personally, against the Son of Man, as He is here significantly termed, in error or in ignorance, like that of Saul, who "thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." That would beforgiven upon repentance. But these who, like the Pharisees, could not recognise the Spirit of holiness in His work on earth, and who obstinately refused to listen to the teaching which proceeded from Him, were in a hopelessly lost condition. The text then is an assurance to the Apostles that God would be with them in their work and that He would severely condemn every kind of obstinate opposition to it. Thus the declaration is closely connected with that which immediately follows it. It is promised (verse 12) that the Holy Ghost shall speak in and through the disciples: consequently the most terrible judgment is denounced against those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost speaking by them.

11. *And when they.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. x. 17, 20, where the same assurance occurs in the charge to the Twelve. It does not occur in the charge to the Twelve as given by St. Luke (ch. ix. 1-5), or in that to the Seventy (ch. x. 1-24): and it is peculiarly suitable to its position here, in which Jesus warns His disciples of the great opposition which they will immediately have to encounter, and encourages them to bear it, than to either of the addresses just referred to.

*unto the synagogues.*] In Matt. x. 17, 18 we have "councils," "synagogues," "governors and kings." In either case the list is exhaustive, including Jewish ('councils,' and 'synagogues') and Gentile ('governors,' 'kings' or 'emperors,' and 'powers' &c.) authorities.

12. *For the Holy Ghost.*] More fully expressed in Matt. x. 19, 20; but this special mention of the Holy Ghost, as Paraclete, or Advocate, agrees closely with St. John's account of our Lord's teaching, and is justly regarded by Renan as, taken in combination with other passages, a proof of correspondence between the third and fourth gospels, and a mark of historical accuracy in the latter: cf. 'Vie de Jésus,' ed. 15, p. 521.

13 ¶ And one of the company said unto him, Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me.

14 And he said unto him, Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?

15 And he said unto them, Take heed, and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.

16 And he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully:

17 And he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits?

18 And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods.

19 And I will say to my soul,

---

13-21. WARNING AGAINST COVETOUSNESS.

13. *And one of the company.*] Or, "**And one of the multitude;**" *i. e.* of the large crowd which was assembled round Him: verse 1. This incident, with the parable arising out of it (verses 13-21), is peculiar to St. Luke. Of the man who prefers this request to our Lord we know nothing. He can scarcely have been a disciple whether we make the words "out of the crowd" depend upon "a certain man," or (as Meyer) upon "spoke unto him." Probably, he had heard our Lord's teaching for the first time, and was so impressed by it (like the woman mentioned ch. xi. 27) that he went at once to the subject nearest to his heart. We may conceive him to have been a younger son (compare ch. xv. 11, 12), not satisfied with his share of the family inheritance. However this may be, our Lord, as elsewhere (compare John viii. 3, 11), steadily refuses to go beyond the province of spiritual teaching into that of earthly law, or to interfere with the action of the constituted authorities of the country. There is a special fitness in such a declaration made in a public discourse at a time when His enemies were watching Him with a view to convict Him of illegality. In the first word of His answer ("Man") we hear a tone of reproof: and in the reply itself there seems to be an allusion to Exod. ii. 14. Our Lord then takes occasion by this request to deliver a warning against covetousness, which He enforces by a parable. This is addressed to the people generally (verses 15-21),—what follows (verse 22) to the disciples.

15. *of covetousness.*] Or, as all the best MSS and Versions read, "**Of every kind of covetousness.**"

*for a man's life.*] Or, more probably, "**For not because one has abundance, does his life therefore depend on the things which he hath**" (Kuinöl, Meyer, Oosterzee). The meaning is that abundance is not a necessary condition of existence, a man lives on what he possesses, all that is needed is a mere sufficiency. This is simpler, and more in accordance with the context than De Wette's interpretation, "For not because one has abundance, is his life (therefore) a part of his goods," *i. e.* is he sure of it. The passage is no doubt a very difficult one, but the rendering proposed above seems to be altogether the most satisfactory.

16. *The ground.*] There is a certain resemblance between the following parable and Ecclus. xi. 18, 19; not a sufficient one, however, to enable us to say, with Stier, that our Lord quoted from, or referred to, the Apocrypha; still less enough to justify our saying, with De Wette, that the parable is clearly from Jesus the Son of Sirach. Less questionable is the reference to the last part of the 49th Psalm. We see in the character of the rich man a combination of activity in promoting his own temporal interest (verse 17) with a selfish love of ease and pleasure (verse 19): in a word, the man is thoroughly worldly: he can see only two uses for his possessions, selfish enjoyment of them, and the means of increasing them. The "soul" which he addresses, is the seat of the emotions and of the power of enjoyment,—not the spiritual element in man. The frequent repetition of the personal pronoun is characteristic, "my fruits," "my barns," "my goods," and above all "my soul," as if the last were a secure possession. This last touch prepares us for the terrible answer, "Fool, in this night shall they (not the angels, nor, as Paulus and others, murderers: the verb is impersonal) demand thy soul from thee: and the things which thou preparedst, for whom shall they be?" "'This night' is opposed to 'many years;' as 'they shall require' to 'thy soul.'" (Godet.)

18. *all.*] "Not a word of the poor." (Bengel.)

*my fruits.*] A different word from that word in the preceding verse, either "produce," or, according to some MSS, "corn."

Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, *and* be merry.

20 But God said unto him, *Thou* fool, this night [1]thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?

[1] Or, *do they require thy soul.*

21 So *is* he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.

22 ¶ And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, [a]Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on.

[a] Matt. 6. 25.

23 The life is more than meat, and the body *is more* than raiment.

24 Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them: how much more are ye better than the fowls?

25 And which of you with taking thought can add to his stature one cubit?

26 If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why take ye thought for the rest?

27 Consider the lilies how they grow: they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

28 If then God so clothe the grass, which is to day in the field, and to morrow is cast into the oven; how much more *will he clothe* you, O ye of little faith?

29 And seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, [1]neither be ye of doubtful mind.

[1] Or, *live not in careful suspense.*

30 For all these things do the nations of the world seek after: and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things.

31 ¶ But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you.

32 Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

---

**21.** *rich toward God.*] *I. e.*, "is not rich in spiritual goods, and therefore rich in God's sight." Compare verses 33, 34, and, for a similar antithesis between literal and spiritual wealth, James ii. 5. Borneman, however, maintains that the meaning is 'devoting his riches to God's service,' in contrast with selfish appropriation.

22-30. WARNING AGAINST CAREFULNESS.

**22.** *And he said unto.*] The last discourse, including the parable, was spoken to the assembled crowd (verses 15, 16), this which follows (verses 22-40) is expressly said to have been spoken to the disciples; it is continued, with especial reference to the Apostles, in answer to a question of St. Peter's (verses 41-53), and is followed by another discourse addressed to the multitude (verses 54-59). The speech to the disciples which begins at this point, is an exhortation to use this world as not abusing it: it is closely connected with the foregoing parable, teaching the same lessons with regard both to this world's goods (verses 22-34), and to being in a state of constant preparation (verses 35-40). But, as might be expected in a charge especially addressed to the disciples, it is conceived in a higher tone of unworldliness than that which had just been delivered to the people. They are not merely to "beware of covetousness," they are to "take no thought for their life." The discourse, as has been already stated, falls into two parts. The first section, which deals with the things of this life, and the true attitude of the disciple in regard to them (verses 22-34) is also found, with slight variations, in different parts of St. Matthew's Gospel; the greatest part of it (verses 22-31) occurring, almost as we find it here, in the Sermon on the Mount. The special suitableness to this last period of our Lord's ministry must be recognised. (Compare and see notes on Matt. vi. 24-33.)

*Therefore I say.*] The word "therefore" links the discourse on to the preceding parable, as, in the Sermon on the Mount, to the saying, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."

**24.** *the ravens.*] In Matt. vi. 26 it is "the fowls of the air."

**26.** *If ye then be, &c.*] Peculiar to Luke.

31-40. INJUNCTIONS TO PREPARATION FOR THE COMING KINGDOM.

**32.** *Fear not, little flock.*] Of the remaining part of this section of our Lord's discourse

33 Sell that ye have, and give alms; [f] provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth.

f Matt. 6. 20.

34 For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

35 [g] Let your loins be girded about, and *your* lights burning;

g 1 Pet. 1. 13.

36 And ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding: that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately.

37 Blessed *are* those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them.

38 And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find *them* so, blessed are those servants.

---

to the disciples, this verse, and the beginning of the next, are altogether peculiar to St. Luke, the rest being found in a somewhat different form in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 19-21, where see notes). And it cannot be denied that these words are more in place here than in the Sermon on the Mount, where they stand in no definite relation to the context. Here, the discourse flows on without interruption. The disciples were to disengage themselves from the cares of the world: God would shew the same care for them that He shews for all His creatures: and they above all, that "little flock" of faithful servants, ought not to disquiet themselves with any anxiety: they were the heirs of the heavenly kingdom which God had designed for them: why then should they cling to any earthly inheritance: rather let them give up whatever they had in this world, and lay up for themselves treasures in heaven.

33. *and give alms.*] Rather, "**And give it in alms.**" With the precept, compare Matt. xix. 21, 29; Acts iv. 34-37. The abandonment of their possessions is not here demanded of all Christians, but only of the little flock of disciples who accompanied Christ, and for whom detachment from worldly ties was necessary for their vocation. Nothing is said here about the sale of their possessions and giving the money to the poor being a means or condition of their inheriting the kingdom: on the contrary, it was pledged to them already (verse 32), and Jesus gives them this precept, not (as in Matt. xix. 21) as a test of sincerity, still less as a counsel of perfection, but because they were to be, not merely citizens, but officers, of the kingdom of heaven, and because earthly ties would hinder their work (so Meyer, Godet). We find the same principle applied to another subject in 1 Cor. vii.; see especially verse 26.

35. *Let your loins.*] We enter here upon the second section of this discourse (verses 35-40), which is certainly not unconnected with the first, inasmuch as detachment from this world is closely related to preparedness for the next. The same two lessons were combined in the Parable of the Rich Fool (verses 16-20), which are here addressed, in a higher strain, to the disciples. The opening part of it (verses 35-38) is quite peculiar to St. Luke, nor can we say (with De Wette) that it "alludes to the Parable of the Ten Virgins" (Matt. xxv. 1-12), although, doubtless, it closely resembles it in its imagery. They were (like the ten maidens in that parable) to wait for their Master to conduct him home after the wedding-feast, with their "loins girt about," in order that they might be fit and ready to serve him (the long garments of the East would otherwise prevent active exertion), and with their "lights burning," because the wedding-feast takes place in the night. Our Lord then passes from this similitude to another, also made use of by Him elsewhere, in which the suddenness and unexpectedness of His coming is compared to a thief in the night (verse 39), and concludes with the practical exhortation (verse 40) which immediately follows that similitude in St. Matthew's Gospel. Compare and see notes on Matt. xxiv. 43, 44.

36. *ye yourselves.*] Emphatic as opposed to the "loins" and "lights" of verse 35.

*he will return.*] Or "**He may return.**"

37. *he shall gird himself.*] Compare John xiii. 4.

38. *in the second watch, or.*] *I.e.* however late the return might be. "Among the ancient Jews the night had only three divisions (Judges vii. 19); later, probably from the time of the Roman domination, four were counted; from 6 to 9, from 9 to midnight, from midnight to 3, and from 3 to 6. If, as cannot be doubted, the Master's return signifies the coming of Christ, this parable reminds us that that event may well be long delayed, much longer than any one imagined,

[a] Matt. 24. 43.

39 And [a]this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through.

40 Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not.

41 ¶ Then Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all?

42 And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom *his* lord shall make ruler over his household, to give *them their* portion of meat in due season?

43 Blessed *is* that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.

44 Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath.

45 But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken;

46 The lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will [1]cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.

[1] Or, *cut him off.*

---

even among the disciples, and that this delay would involve a test of their fidelity" (Godet). There is one peculiarity in the form of expression here used which deserves notice. The Jews, as has just been said, divided the night at this time into four watches: it has been asked why, of these, the second and third only are specified. Apparently this is necessary for the completeness of the picture: the banquet would not be over before the conclusion of the first watch, and in the fourth, the day would be breaking (De Wette, Meyer).

**39.** *And this know.*] Or, very probably, as Godet, "And this ye know." He appeals to common sense. These two verses somewhat interrupt the train of thought, and may possibly have been inserted by the Evangelist from similarity of subject, having been spoken on some other occasion. See Matt. xxiv. 43, 44.

### 41–49. The Special Warning to St. Peter.

**41.** *Then Peter said.*] In Matt. xxiv. 44-51 (where see notes) the largest part of our Lord's reply to this question (*i.e.* verses 42-46) appears as a portion of the great prophecy delivered on the Mount of Olives, in which it immediately follows the words which appear here in verses 39, 40. Whether the words were actually spoken on that occasion alone, or whether, from likeness of subject, they have been attached to the prediction of the second Advent in St. Matthew's Gospel, this is not the place to consider. It is impossible, however, to doubt that they are in their proper place here. Meyer says of the question, "It is certainly original, and all the more certainly, because of the slender thread which unites all that follows down to verse 48 to such a question." The fact is, that which follows is not a direct answer to the question, although it involves its answer. "Jesus makes as if He were continuing His discourse without regard to Peter's enquiry. But in reality He gives to His exhortation to vigilance such a turn that it results in an exact answer to that enquiry. Compare a similar form ch. xix. 25, 26; John xiv. 22, 23, and elsewhere" (Godet). The word "therefore" in Matt. xxiv. 45 links the words which follow to those which precede. So also it does here. The question of Peter is, apparently, passed by unnoticed; but it is the means of giving a new turn to the discourse, which is not so easily accounted for in the parallel passage.

We have now to consider the drift of St. Peter's question, and the general course of thought. It looks back, not so much to the last words of our Lord as to the semi-parable of the master returning from the wedding-feast. Compare the question of Peter, Matt. xix. 27. The Apostle asked, whether this reward was offered to all the disciples and followers of Christ, who were addressed generally in the foregoing discourse (verse 22), or whether it belonged especially to the Apostles, and to such as should bear rule in the kingdom of heaven. The reply is, in effect, that the larger the powers and opportunities entrusted to any servant of Christ, the greater the measure of watchfulness needed on his part, lest he should either neglect or abuse them.

**42.** *Who then is.*] The answer opens with a question. Compare the form of expression in ch. xi. 5; also in ch. xi. 11, where see note.

**46.** *unbelievers.*] In Matt. xxiv. 51 it is "hypocrites."

47 And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not *himself*, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many *stripes*.

48 But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few *stripes*. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.

49 ¶ I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?

---

**47.** *And that servant.*] These two verses are peculiar to this Gospel. They link themselves very naturally to the foregoing discourse. They lay down the general principle upon which the teaching given (verses 42–46) rests, viz. that results must be proportionate to opportunities.

*prepared not himself.*] Or, more probably, "**made not ready,**" *i.e.* the things required.

**48.** *But he that knew not.*] The justice of the former saying is obvious: that of this, however, does not lie quite so much on the surface. The difficulty has been variously explained; the simplest solution is that of Meyer, "Such a servant cannot remain unpunished, not because he has not obeyed his lord's will (for that was unknown to him) but because he has done that for which he deserved to be punished." Godet points out a practical application of this principle to the Gentile world, in Rom. ii. 12–15.

*For unto whomsoever.*] There is in this sentence a sort of Hebrew parallelism; but there is also something more. The powers and privileges are not merely *given*,—they are *entrusted*,—and are therefore still the property of Him who gave them, and to be used in His service. Meyer points out the sharp antithesis which is not quite preserved in the collocation of words in the Authorised Version. It should be, "To every one to whom there was given much, much shall be required of him: and to whom they" (impersonal, as in the next clause, and in verse 20, where see note) "entrusted much, much more" (not as Meyer, "more than was entrusted," but "more" than of others, to whom less was entrusted") "will they ask of him."

49–59. Announcement of Trials and special Warnings.

**49.** *I am come to.*] With regard to the remainder of our Lord's address to the Apostles (verses 49–53) several difficult questions may be raised, which, however, cannot altogether be considered separately. (1) What is the connexion, if any, with the immediately preceding words? (2) What is the connexion of thought in the passage itself? (3) What is the meaning of "fire" in verse 49? (4) What is the meaning of the last clause of that verse? In the remainder of the passage there is no difficulty beyond that of connexion. The "baptism" of verse 50 is the baptism of blood (compare and see note on Matt. xx. 22); and the three following verses (verses 51–53) occur with little variation in Matt. x. 34–36 (where also see notes) as part of the charge to the Twelve. (1) The connexion of this section with the foregoing one is explained by Meyer, of the severe tests of fidelity and vigilance which would result from the character of the times through which the disciples were soon about to pass. It is somewhat better explained by Godet, of the character of the times, the epoch of a great crisis, which forbade Christ's servants to give themselves up to self-indulgence, like the "evil servant" in verse 46, or in accordance with the selfish thought which he thinks may underlie Peter's question, verse 41 (compare the words of Elisha to Gehazi: 2 Kings v. 26). (2) The internal connexion of the passage seems to be something like this. The imminent future is very critical. The object of Christ's coming was to awaken in men's minds a spiritual excitement which would disturb and divide the world, producing not peace, but a sword, so much so that He Himself would suffer (verse 50) in the course of the conflict which His own teaching had aroused. (3) "I am come" (or rather, "**I came,**" the tense referring to the historical fact of the Incarnation) "**to cast fire on the earth.**" The fire has been variously interpreted. The Fathers generally understood it of the fire of the Holy Spirit, others (as Bleek) of God's word. Meyer explains it of the stirring and tumult which would take place in men's minds in consequence of the coming, teaching, and life of Christ. Thus the saying is closely connected with what follows verses 51–53. "Everything fertile (in results) is rich in wars," says Renan (quoted by Godet, who understands the passage in the same sense). Compare ch. ii. 54, 55. (4) The remainder of verse 49 has been variously rendered; as, by Godet, "And what" more "do I wish, if it be already kindled," as if He had said, the fire is already kindled, therefore my work is done: in close connexion with what follows in verse 50. Better is the rendering of

50 But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I [1]straitened till it be accomplished!

[1] Or, *pained.*

51 [a]Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division:

[a] Matt. 10. 34.

52 For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three.

53 The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother in law against her daughter in law, and the daughter in law against her mother in law.

54 ¶ And he said also to the

---

Kuinöl, De Wette, Olshausen, Meyer, and Bleek. "How I wish that it were already kindled!" but, on the whole, the translation of Grotius seems the best, "And what will I?" (what do I desire now?): "O that it were already kindled." On the passage, "I am come," &c., Godet notes that it could only be spoken by one who had a consciousness of pre-existence; while Meyer observes that the expression, "to *cast* fire on the earth," is spoken from the point of view of His heavenly origin.

**50.** *how am I straitened.*] Pressed; in a strait or difficulty; distracted; compare John xii. 27. He speaks as one deeply moved; it is, as it were, an anticipation of Gethsemane.

**51.** *that I am come.*] Or, *That I arrived:* as to the force of the tense, see above, on verse 49.

*division.*] In Matt. x. 34, it is "a sword."

**52.** *For from henceforth.*] According to the reading of ℵ B D L and other MSS adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, the following will read thus: "For there shall be from henceforth five in one house divided. Three shall be divided against two, and two against three: the father against the son, and the son against the father," &c. What follows is more fully stated in the text than in the parallel passage of St. Matthew. There, only three members of each family are specified, and the whole number is not given. Here their entire number is five, and is said to be divided into two parties of two and three respectively: the former representing the elder and the latter the younger generation. This delicate touch must surely be original, it is true to nature, and it recalls the divisions supposed in Mal. iv. 6.

**54.** *And he said also.*] The short address which completes this series (verses 54-59), and which St. Luke reports to have been spoken "to the people" (or rather, "**to the multitudes**"), the great crowds who are represented as assembled round our Lord throughout this scene (verse 1), contains two elements, each of which, or something like it, is found in the Gospel of St. Matthew, though in altogether different contexts. The first (verses 54-56) occurs in Matt. xvi. 2, 3 (where see note) in answer to the Pharisees' request for a sign from heaven. It is most likely that the saying may have been uttered twice (compare, and see note on ch. ix. 57); and this is all the more likely since the signs of the weather are quite different in the two cases. The suitableness to this occasion is clear; most probably also to the season, see note on ch. ix. 51. Jesus had just warned His disciples of the critical times through which they were about to pass, and of their need of watchfulness and self-denial for passing safely through them. He now turns to the multitudes around Him, and in parabolical and enigmatical language, such, however, as would be understood by those who had "ears to hear" (compare Matt. xiii. 9-17). He warns them also that the time is critical, upbraids them with spiritual blindness for not being able to see it (verses 54-57), and urges them to make, each one, *at once*, his peace with God (verses 58, 59). De Wette thinks that the whole passage, verses 54-56, is taken from Matt. xvi. 2, 3, somewhat softened down. The difference between the signs specified, and the remarkable, though not obvious, fitness of the passage in its place here, are both strongly against that theory. The second element, which is also found in St. Matthew (verses 58, 59) occurs in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 25, 26, where see note). In that position, it has certainly the air of having been, as it has been expressed before, *attracted* to the context by the mere association of ideas. It is attached to the spiritual interpretation of the Sixth Commandment, which is explained as forbidding all malicious words and thoughts; and although the similarity of subject is obvious, the train of thought is not. Neither is the train of thought obvious here; but it is deep and natural. These two verses form, in fact, a parable. But it is a parable of which the details must not be too closely pressed. The real point lies not in its details, but in its general lesson: in the urgent appeal to the people to make their peace with God

[b Matt. 16. 2.] people, [b]When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is.

55 And when *ye see* the south wind blow, ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass.

56 *Ye* hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time?

57 Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?

58 ¶ [c]When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, *as thou art* in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. [c Matt. 5. 25.]

59 I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last [1]mite. [1 See Mark 12. 42.]

---

without loss of time, represented by the advice to come to agreement with a creditor on the way to the court.

*a cloud.*] Or, according to the received reading, "**the cloud:**" the weight of external authority is perhaps rather against the insertion of the definite article, but the consideration that it is more easy to account for its omission than its addition, may be allowed to turn the scale in its favour. "*The* cloud" points to the phenomenon as a well-known prognostic. The rains in Palestine come up from the Mediterranean, and, as with us, are commonly preceded by a cloud rising on the coasts. (Compare 1 Kings xviii. 44.) The south wind, coming across the desert, brings a dry heat. On this occasion there appears to be a reference to the season. The "latter rain" falls in early spring.

*straightway.*] The adverb is emphatic and important. The people, accustomed to judge the weather by signs, arrived at their conclusions *at once* and without hesitation. And the conclusions are invariably true: this is marked by the repetition "and so it is," "and it cometh to pass," (the same verb in the original). The rapidity and certainty of their conclusions in this matter are contrasted with their slowness and dulness in seeing the signs of the times, and in acting upon them.

**56.** *Ye hypocrites.*] The people at large were hypocrites so far as they were satisfied with decency and respectability, custom and routine and tradition—so far as they were content with a form of godliness—so far as they failed to apply to all actions the test of conduct which God had given them, and "of themselves" to judge what was right. Such men can never see the signs of the times: they can only perceive the outside of things, and are wholly devoid of spiritual insight.

*this time.*] Or, "this season;" this special time, which above all things calls us on to amendment. Matthew has "the signs of the times."

**57.** *Yea, and why.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. A further charge against the people: they not only failed to read the signs of the times, they did not (as it is implied they ought to have done) see and decide on the right course without any sign. God had given to every one of them the light of reason and of conscience, even if there had not been something in the condition of things around them to awaken serious thought.

*what is right.*] Literally, "what is just" or "righteousness." But in Scriptural usage righteousness, or justice, commonly stands for the whole of moral duty; and so it does here; that which was "right" in the case of the people, being more especially amendment and reconciliation with God. But this particular word appears to suggest the following parable, as it may fairly be called. The notion of strict justice suggests the idea of a debt due from man to God, a figure under which sin is commonly represented (compare Matt. vi. 12; xviii. 23-35; ch. vii. 41-43).

**58.** *When thou goest.*] Or "**For when thou goest**" (*i.e.* "namely, when thou goest," explanatory of "what is right" verse 58) "**with thine adversary**" (*one* adversary in a lawsuit) "**to a magistrate, by the way give diligence to be delivered from him.**" The words "by the way" are rendered emphatic by their position; upon them the stress of the sentence rests: and the point of it is, "*lose no time* in making satisfaction."

*the officer.*] Literally "the exactor," whose duty it was to compel the payment of the debt.

**59.** *the very last mite.*] Literally "even the last mite." See marginal note on Mark xii. 42.

## CHAPTER XIII.

1 *Christ preacheth repentance upon the punishment of the Galilæans, and others.* 6 *The fruitless fig tree may not stand.* 11 *He healeth the crooked woman:* 18 *sheweth the powerful working of the word in the hearts of his chosen, by the parable of the grain of mustard seed, and of leaven:* 24 *exhorteth to enter in at the strait gate,* 31 *and reproveth Herod and Jerusalem.*

THERE were present at that season some that told him of the Galilæans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.

2 And Jesus answering said unto them, Suppose ye that these Galilæans were sinners above all the Galilæans, because they suffered such things?

3 I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.

4 Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were [1]sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem?

[1] Or, *debtors.*

5 I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.

6 ¶ He spake also this parable; A certain *man* had a fig tree planted in his vineyard; and he came and

---

CHAP. XIII. 1. *There were present.*] "**Now there were present at that particular time certain persons telling him.**" The information brought to our Lord by the bystanders is best understood by supposing it to have been given in relation to the short discourse which closes the last chapter (ch. xii. 54-59). The communication was evidently made with the idea that the Galilæans spoken of in the text were great sinners, and that their violent death was what men call "a judgment" upon them. Men have been prone to attribute extraordinary misfortune to extraordinary criminality from the days of Job downwards. That this notion was uppermost in the minds of the speakers is clear from our Lord's reply. But their communication is more intelligible (as well as our Lord's reply to it), if we consider that it was made just when He was urging men to repentance and reconciliation to God, in the view of a period of impending judgment. Thus this passage may be regarded as the closing term in the series of discourses which began with ch. xii. 1. The whole, in fact, forms one connected scene. Of the two facts here spoken of (verses 1, 4), history makes no mention. We know from Josephus that riots often took place at Jerusalem. This one probably occurred at one of the great feasts, at which the Galilæans would be present. We further learn from the Evangelists that an insurrection had been suppressed by Pilate with extreme cruelty shortly before our Lord's arrival at Jerusalem; see note on Matt. xxvii. 16.

*whose blood.*] There is something, as Meyer observes, dramatic and tragic about the form of expression. The fact that the Galilæans were slaughtered (as must be supposed) in the Temple, and during the time of the sacrifices being offered, is put forward in order to paint the catastrophe in its darkest colours, and apparently to express most strongly the speaker's sense of the sufferers' demerits.

3. *except ye repent.*] Our Lord takes occasion to enforce the lesson of ch. xii. 58, 59.

4. *Siloam.*] The well of Siloam (see John ix. 7) stood near a re-entering angle of the city walls, at the entrance of the valley Tyropœon, which runs up between Mounts Sion and Moriah. See the description and view of the pool in the Dictionary of the Bible.

*sinners.*] "**Debtors.**" Compare and see on ch. xii. 57.

6–9. PARABLE OF THE BARREN FIG-TREE.

6. *A certain man.*] The general teaching of this parable, which is not found in any other Gospel, is sufficiently plain. It is closely connected with ch. xii. 58, 59, and with verses 3, 5 of this chapter. But it speaks in particular with the same voice as Rom. ii. 4, "The goodness of God leadeth" (rather, is leading, or endeavouring to lead) "thee to repentance." About the meaning of its details there has been much variety of opinion. Who is the landowner? Who is the dresser of the vineyard? What is the vineyard itself? What the fig-tree? Is there any special meaning (and if so what) in the three years? The owner and the dresser of the vineyard are ordinarily interpreted of God and Christ respectively (so Bleek, Olshausen, Trench, Godet, and somewhat doubtfully, Oosterzee). To this view it is no objection that the owner *comes* to seek fruit. The coming of Christ is identified with the coming of God—they are in fact convertible terms. The vineyard appears to represent the church of

sought fruit thereon, and found none.

7 Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?

8 And he answering said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung *it*:

9 And if it bear fruit, *well*: and if not, *then* after that thou shalt cut it down.

10 And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath.

11 ¶ And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up *herself*.

12 And when Jesus saw her, he called *her to him*, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity.

13 And he laid *his* hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God.

14 And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath day, and said unto the people, There

---

God on earth, Jewish or Gentile, but regarded as one from the beginning. In the days of Isaiah or of Asaph (Isa. v. 1-7; Ps. lxxx. 8-16) it was conterminous with the people of Israel, but it is to be distinguished from it in thought. The fig-tree signifies the people of Israel, with all the national peculiarities of religion, whether legal or traditional, which had grown up within it. This gives additional force to the last clause of verse 7. The continuance of their privileges to Israel stood in the way of God's merciful purpose towards others (Rom. xi. 19). In the three years some have seen allusion to God's various successive calls to Israel, by the Law, the Prophets, and by Christ (Augustine, Theophylact); others (as Bengel, Wieseler, Lewin, 'F. S.' p. 225, and Alford, with perhaps Olshausen), to the three years of our Saviour's ministry. To this Meyer objects that a fourth year is mentioned verse 8. He (with Grotius, Kuinöl, Bleek, Godet) interpret the three years of the past, and the fourth year of the remaining, time of grace accorded to Israel. It is difficult to resist the impression that in the three years there is at least an allusion to the period of our Saviour's ministry on earth.

7. *why cumbereth it the ground?*] Rather, "**Why doth it make the ground idle too?**" *i.e.* "Why is it not merely unfruitful itself, but in the way of something better?"

9. *if it bear fruit, well.*] The word "well" is inserted by our translators, in the place of a significant aposiopesis.

*after that.*] The words so rendered are omitted by old MSS and Versions.

11-17. MIRACLE OF HEALING ON THE SABBATH.

10. *And he was teaching.*] The narrative which follows (verses 10-17) is peculiar to this Gospel; but the two parables which immediately follow it, and which Luke clearly represents to have been spoken on this occasion, are also found among the Parables of the Kingdom in Matt. xiii. We are to understand that the event occurred during this period of travelling, although, from the absence of any note of time, we are unable to determine the relation between it and the foregoing series of discourses. Jesus never failed to attend the synagogue on the Sabbath, and took the opportunity of teaching, in accordance with the rule which permitted members of the congregation accidentally present to exercise the teacher's function. (Compare and see note on ch. iv. 16-22.)

11. *a spirit of infirmity.*] The woman is spoken of as being actually under the influence of an evil spirit (compare the language of Jesus, verse 16) who had power to produce "infirmity," *i.e.* strictly, bodily weakness. (Compare ch. xi. 14 and the parallels there referred to.) The close and mysterious connexion between the will and the nervous system makes it very conceivable that this disorder depended directly on mental causes; and thus, admitting the historical fact of demoniacal possession, we are somewhat better able to connect physical infirmities, such as that described in the text, with such a cause.

12. *thou art loosed.*] Or, "**thou hast been loosed.**" With the declaration of the cure as a past and accomplished fact, compare our Lord's declaration of a spiritual cure, ch. v. 20.

14. *the ruler of the synagogue.*] Compare ch. viii. 49. The ruler does not dare to rebuke Jesus directly, but administers an indirect reproof to Him addressing the people.

are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day.

15 The Lord then answered him, and said, *Thou* hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or *his* ass from the stall, and lead *him* away to watering?

16 And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day?

17 And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.

18 ¶ [d] Then said he, Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I resemble it?

[d] Matt. 13. 31.

19 It is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his garden; and it grew, and waxed a great tree; and the fowls of the air lodged in the branches of it.

20 And again he said, Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God?

21 It is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three [1] measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.

[1] See Matt. 13. 33.

---

*There are six days.*] Exod. xx. 9.

**15.** *Thou hypocrite.*] The true reading is apparently "Ye hypocrites." It is addressed to the ruler of the synagogue and those who were about Him. As Euthymius says, they pretended to defend the law of the Sabbath from violation, while all they wanted was to stir up enmity against Jesus. This was shown by their own neglect of that law, in the strictness of the letter, in such things as they looked upon as matters of necessity. Compare and see notes on Matt. xii. 10-13.

*doth not each one of you . . . . loose?*] The image is chosen because the woman being *bound* by Satan (verse 16) needed also to be *loosed*. In this there is, of course, a special allusion to the form which her disorder had taken.

**16.** *daughter of Abraham.*] Compare ch. xix. 9.

*Satan.*] Satan is said to have done that which is spoken of, verse 11, as the act of one of his inferior ministers.

### 18-21. Parables of the Mustard seed and Leaven.

**18.** *Unto what is.*] The two parables which follow occur together among the "Parables of the Kingdom" in Matt. xiii. 31-33 (where see note), and the former of them in the parallel passage, Mark iv. 30-32. To what portion of our Saviour's ministry are we to assign these two parables? There can be little doubt that they were uttered together, both because they are reported together by St. Luke as well as by St. Matthew, and also because they are the necessary complement to one another, giving (as it were) the outside and the inside of the same teaching. Matthew, as we have seen, is in general more disposed to group events and sayings together, according to a principle of mutual resemblance, Luke adopting, as a rule, the chronological order: and, as regards the particular passage now before us, it very naturally falls into its place in St. Luke's narrative, so that we can easily conceive it to have been attracted to the other parables of the kingdom, and to have been thus placed among them in St. Matthew's Gospel. In reference to an objection, Dean Alford, with whom Meyer agrees, has observed: "So far am I from thinking a description of this kind (verse 17) to be a mere general close, put in by the Evangelists, that I would take it as an accurate and graphic account of the immediate effect of our Lord's power and irresistible words, and the following parables as spoken *immediately thereupon*, shewing the people the ultimate conquest which the Kingdom of God should obtain over all opposition, however strong." (So also Meyer, and practically, Godet.) "The Kingdom of God has power of two kinds, a power of *extension*, by which it embraces all nations little by little; and a power of *transformation*, by which it gradually regenerates the whole of human life" . . . . "These two parables form a complete contrast to the picture of the establishment of Messiah's Kingdom which the Jewish imagination had formed. To this shallow notion, Jesus opposes the idea of a truly moral development, which works by spiritual means and takes account of free will, and is consequently slow and progressive. How shall we believe, in view of these parables, that He believed in the immediate nearness of His return?" (Godet.)

[e] Matt. 9. 35.

22 [e] And he went through the cities and villages, teaching, and journeying toward Jerusalem.

23 Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few that be saved? And he said unto them,

[f] Matt. 7. 13.

24 ¶ [f] Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able.

25 When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are:

26 Then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets.

27 [g] But he shall say, I tell you,

[g] Matt. 7. 23.

---

22–30. Warnings on the Journey towards Jerusalem.

**22.** *And he went.*] Or, "**He was going:**" *i.e.* "He continued to do so." This verse marks the transition to a new series of scenes which occurred during the journey from the place in which the preceding discourses had been delivered, probably in the North of Peræa, certainly at a considerable distance from Jerusalem.

**23.** *Then said one.*] Or, "And one said unto him." The question was apparently elicited by our Lord's urgent appeals to His hearers to repent and be reconciled to God, such as those in ch. xii. 54—xiii. 9. The person who asks it is quite undefined. The question itself, however, seems to have been one of curiosity, and in His answer, our Lord gives the conversation a practical turn. In fact, He does not really answer the question at all. He does not say whether few or many are saved. He merely tells His hearers that the work of salvation is an anxious one, and that it must be set about in earnest. Neither does He directly address the speaker. As elsewhere (compare and see note on ch. xii. 41, 42), He takes occasion by the question to address a discourse to all the bystanders: "He said unto them: Strive (plural) to enter," &c.

**24.** *the strait gate.*] The image also occurs, and is somewhat more fully developed in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 13, 14, where see notes). Of the remainder of this short discourse (verses 24-30) expressions closely resembling verses 25-27, verses 28, 29, and verse 30, are found in Matt. vii. 21-23, Matt. viii. 11, 12, and Matt. xix. 30, respectively. (See notes on those passages.) Compare also Matt. xxv. 10-12. "The strait gate," or according to the reading of the oldest MSS "**the narrow door.**" The difference between the two accounts of the Evangelists, shewing that they do not record the same discourse, is thus more strongly marked. "The *gate*" which St. Matthew speaks of is that of the wall surrounding the court: the *door* in this passage is that which admits into the house itself. So that the expression, which has the air of a reference to a saying already made use of, is not so much repeated as modified from its use in the Sermon on the Mount. There is a marked contrast between the verb translated "strive" and that which follows, "seek." It is possible to seek without striving. The command to strive, suggests the image of a large crowd gathered round a narrow postern, and struggling for admission. Such vigorous efforts carry men into the kingdom of heaven. (Compare Matt. xi. 12.) They who are said to seek, seek (*i.e.* desire and wish) and no more. They do not struggle for admission. So far the lesson is one of earnestness and activity. But there is a further contrast. Those who seek and are not able to enter, are not said to seek to enter in at the strait gate. They wish to enter, but not in the appointed way. Thus explained, the passage is divested of an appearance of harshness, which has tempted some (with Beza, Ewald, Lachmann) to connect the following sentence closely with this, an arrangement which altogether destroys the symmetry of the passage.

**25.** *When once.*] Literally, "From the time that." "The abrupt transition gives the passage great force," says Bengel. The sentence, "When once the .... whence ye are" depends upon the following sentence, "Then shall ye," &c. as is shewn by the use of "them." Therefore the moral of the whole saying lies in the latter part of it, *i.e.* verses 26, 27. It is the inefficacy of external privileges to save of themselves. From verse 24 to verse 25 there is a rapid transition. The image of the closed door is preserved. The master of the house, at a certain hour, rises from the table and closes the door, so that even the inmates who may be lingering out too late, are not only refused admission, but are not recognised as members of his family. This is the general outline of the scene: then at verse 26 we come to the point at which the action begins. The excluded persons claim acquaintance with the Master, and are nevertheless refused as "workers of iniquity." (Compare Matt. vii. 21-23.) They represent those who

I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all *ye* workers of iniquity.

28 There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you *yourselves* thrust out.

29 And they shall come from the east, and *from* the west, and from the north, and *from* the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God.

30 [h] And, behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last.

[h] Matt. 19. 30.

31 ¶ The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto him, Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee.

---

thought they could claim admission to the kingdom of heaven as children of Abraham (verses 28, 29), and who would nevertheless be shut out at the last.

**27.** *workers of iniquity.*] The corresponding passage in St. Matthew quoted in the margin has a striking difference in expression. The true word, rendered in both passages in our Version *iniquity*, signify in that passage *sin* in the sense of lawlessness (ἀνομία), a warning to those who should neglect their bounden duties: here our Lord speaking to Jews specially warns them against *sin* in the sense of unrighteousness (ἀδικία), disregard of the fundamental principles of God's kingdom. Renan, as might be expected, regards this as an intentional alteration characteristic of St. Luke ('Les Évangiles,' p. 109, n. 3). It simply proves the independence of the two accounts.

**28.** *when ye shall.*] Similarly it is said in Matt. viii. 11, 12, in relation to the faith of the Gentile centurion.

**30.** *there are last.*] The same proverbial saying is made use of in Matt. xix. 30, xx. 16: here the last are the heathen; the first, the Jews (De Wette).

### 31–35. Message to Herod and Warning to Jerusalem.

**31.** *The same day.*] Or, "**In that very day,**" or as we ought possibly to read "**hour;**" a more precise note of time than is commonly to be found in this portion of St. Luke's history. The account which follows (verses 31-33) is peculiar to this Gospel. We also owe to St. Luke alone the information that Herod Antipas desired to see Jesus (ch. ix. 9), and actually did see Him before the Crucifixion (ch. xxiii. 7-12). It is evident that our Lord was at this time within the dominions of Herod, which comprised Peræa as well as Galilee. It is not quite clear at first sight whether the advice tendered by these Pharisees was inspired by Herod himself, or whether, being desirous of sending Jesus away from their neighbourhood, they made use of Herod's name. We ought probably to accept the former supposition, on account of the following message to Herod, and above all on account of the expression applied to him. "Instead of commanding, like a king, he condescends to play the part of an intriguer," therefore he is called a fox, the symbol of cunning. The message which follows is divided into two parts, each enigmatical, and as it seems designedly obscure. Two or three points may be laid down as certain in the interpretation of this passage. 1st. The present tenses in verse 33 signify, as is very commonly the case, the immediate (De Wette) and certain (Meyer) future. 2ndly. There can be no doubt that the three days specified in verse 33 are a repetition of the three days mentioned in verse 32. "The day following" is clearly identical with "the third day." 3rdly. The closing words of verse 33 are spoken in sad irony, and are especially directed against the Pharisees, of whose system Jerusalem was the heart and centre. Jerusalem, our Lord says, had the sad prerogative of being the slaughter-house of all the prophets (compare verse 34), therefore He was safe till He should arrive there. The doubtful questions of interpretation are, 1st, the meaning of the three days in each verse; 2nd, the meaning of the verb rendered "I am perfected;" 3rd, the meaning of the verb translated "walk" in verse 33; and, finally, we have to consider the interpretation of the whole. 1st. It is certainly most natural to regard the period mentioned as a proverbial expression for a very short space of time. "I work miracles but a day or two longer, and then I am perfected." The mention of three days in verse 32 is interpreted by Olshausen of a definite space of time; by Meyer of the actually remaining days of His Galilæan ministry; and by Resch, *l. c.*, far more probably, of the time which would actually intervene before His departure from Herod's territory. 2ndly. The meaning of the verb rendered, "I am perfected," is more doubtful. That it should be taken as a present verb, though in the sense of an immediate and certain future, has been already said. But it is questioned whether it is to be taken as a passive, as in the Authorised Version with reference to the Lord's death, or as

32 And he said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to day and to morrow, and the third *day* I shall be perfected.

33 Nevertheless I must walk to day, and to morrow, and the *day* following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.

34 [f] O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen *doth gather* her brood under *her* wings, and ye would not!

[f] Matt. 23. 37.

35 Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until *the time* come when ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

---

"I make an end," *i.e.* of this part of my work, viz. the ministry in Galilee; unless indeed, as Resch argues with great force, it means "I complete my work," by the crowning miracle shortly afterwards wrought at Bethany (John xi. 40-44). 3rdly. The meaning of "I must *walk:*" the necessity, indeed, spoken of is no doubt a Divine necessity, existing in God's providence; it is therefore nearly equivalent to an assertion of perfect certainty. But the meaning of the verb translated "walk," which might also be translated "go," or "journey," is disputed: on the whole, considering that it is the very term used by the Pharisees in verse 31 ("*depart* hence"), and that it is also used throughout this portion of the Gospel (ch. ix. 51-xviii. 14) with reference to our Lord's going about from place to place in His journey towards Jerusalem, it seems most reasonable to understand it literally here. We may therefore interpret the whole passage thus: "You tell me that Herod seeks my life. I know that you are only his emissaries, therefore tell that crafty tyrant that I shall not trouble him long, neither do I fear his power. I have but a short time to remain here, doing those works which have so much astonished him (ch. ix. 7-9). Nevertheless, I know that I am safe from him for the short time which is still given to me. God has determined that I shall go about doing good for this little while, and without doubt I shall do so. Besides, to judge from the past, Jerusalem is the place where a prophet must be put to death." The last words are especially spoken against the Pharisees. It has been objected that the Baptist was put to death in Galilee. Oosterzee answers that his death was not an example of a prophet falling a victim to Jewish unbelief.

**32.** *I cast out devils, and I do cures.*] This point calls for special notice. It has been often observed that in this portion of his Gospel, which is independent of the other Synoptists, St. Luke is singularly sparing of accounts of miracles: he records fifteen in the six chapters from iv. to ix. inclusive, in this portion four only: but these words prove that the omission does not denote cessation, on the contrary they intimate such a frequency that a continuous account would be scarcely possible. St. Luke records those only which are connected with points in our Lord's teaching, to which he is specially careful to direct attention.

**34.** *Jerusalem, Jerusalem.*] The same words (verses 34, 35) with slight variations occur at the close of our Lord's denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees spoken in the Temple (Matt. xxiii. 37-39, where see notes). It is possible that they may have been spoken originally on the occasion to which they are assigned by Matthew (Kuinöl, Meyer, Oosterzee, and of course De Wette); or that they may have been spoken on the occasion mentioned in the text, and embodied in St. Matthew's recital on account of the similarity of subject (Olshausen, Godet); or that they, or words like them, were spoken twice (Alford, who points out that the exclamation of the multitudes during the triumphal entry may have arisen out of this *previous* saying of Christ). On this general question see the note on Matt. xxiii. 37. It is enough to say here, that the saying is peculiarly suitable to its position in this place, and attaches itself to the last words of verse 33 in a very natural and life-like manner. Neither is it any objection to this that the words (according to St. Luke's report) were not spoken in Jerusalem itself, but in Peræa. (See, however, Note at the end of the chapter.) Those to whom, and against whom, the foregoing words were uttered, were in fact representatives of Jerusalem, and of the spirit which prevailed there; and the consideration that this lamentation over the obduracy of Jerusalem was poured forth at a distance from the city itself, only makes it more touching.

**35.** *desolate.*] This word is omitted here by the oldest and best MSS. It was probably taken from the corresponding passage in St. Matthew's Gospel.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE on verse 34.

**34.** The close connexion between this and the preceding verse naturally gives the impression that they belong to the same discourse. Still, in this and similar cases, we must remember St. Luke's constant habit of omitting notices of time and place, and of bringing together discourses which refer to one general subject. Here Resch is probably right in assuming a break in the narrative. Within a very few days our Lord left the territory of Herod. St. John tells us that the immediate occasion of His journey to Bethany, which was in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, was the call from the sisters of Lazarus. Two days after receiving their message He set out on His journey; and there is no improbability in the conjecture, that after the completion of His greatest miracle, followed by a deliberate resolution of the Jewish leaders to destroy Him, He looked down on Jerusalem and uttered these words, afterwards repeated at the same spot, on the Mount of Olives. The arguments by which Resch supports this view are stated forcibly in the second article to which we have referred in the Additional Note on ch. iv. 16.

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

*2 Christ healeth the dropsy on the sabbath: 7 teacheth humility: 12 to feast the poor: 15 under the parable of the great supper, sheweth how worldly minded men, who contemn the word of God, shall be shut out of heaven. 25 Those who will be his disciples, to bear their cross must make their accounts aforehand, lest with shame they revolt from him afterward, 34 and become altogether unprofitable, like salt that hath lost his savour.*

AND it came to pass, as he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath day, that they watched him.

2 And, behold, there was a certain man before him which had the dropsy.

3 And Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?

4 And they held their peace. And he took *him*, and healed him, and let him go;

5 And answered them, saying, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not

---

CHAP. XIV.—1-14. HEALING, AND DISCOURSES IN THE HOUSE OF A PHARISEE ON THE SABBATH.

**1.** *as he went.*] Or "**When he was come.**" The whole of this scene (verses 1-24) is peculiar to St. Luke, unless we are to except the parable with which it closes, and which appears (or one nearly resembling it) in Matt. xxii. 2-14. It occurred at the same period of our Lord's journeyings, and as it would seem at no great distance from Jerusalem: see note on ch. ix. 51. There is some doubt about the exact meaning of the expression "one of the chief Pharisees," literally "one of the rulers of the Pharisees." But we may most naturally understand it to mean simply one of the leaders of the party. It may seem surprising to find Jesus in the house of a leader of the Pharisees, after His severe denunciations of them at the entertainment described ch. x. 37. But this is explained by the last words of verse 1, and by what follows in verse 2.

*they watched.*] This, be it observed, is the principal verb, and so contains the pith of the sentence. The invitation of the Pharisee was a treacherous one. He had set a snare, in accordance with the notice ch. xi. 53, 54, and, as it would seem from the word "behold" in verse 2 (indicating, as usual, an unexpected occurrence), he now introduced a sick man on the Sabbath, for the express purpose of seeing what Jesus would do (Oosterzee, Godet). From verse 3 it appears that our Lord divined his treacherous purpose: observe especially the word "answering."

**3.** *Is it lawful?*] According to ℵ B D L we should insert "**or not**" after "the Sabbath-day."

**5.** *ass.*] The great mass of MS authority, with that of two ancient versions, is in favour of reading "son." The received reading, which is supported by ℵ, four uncials, all other old Versions, and retained by Scrivener, may be owing to the apparently more natural connexion between "ass" and "ox." (Compare ch. xiii. 15.) "If thy son, or (even) thine ox."

straightway pull him out on the sabbath day?

6 And they could not answer him again to these things.

7 ¶ And he put forth a parable to those which were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief rooms; saying unto them,

8 When thou art bidden of any *man* to a wedding, sit not down in the highest room; lest a more honourable man than thou be bidden of him;

9 And he that bade thee and him come and say to thee, Give this man place; and thou begin with shame to take the lowest room.

10 [a] But when thou art bidden, go and sit down in the lowest room; that when he that bade thee cometh, he may say unto thee, Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou have worship in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee.

[a] Prov. 25. 6, 7.

11 [b] For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

[b] Matt. 23. 12.

12 ¶ Then said he also to him that bade him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor *thy* rich neighbours; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompence be made thee.

13 But when thou makest a feast, call [c] the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind:

[c] Tobit 4. 7.

14 And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.

15 ¶ And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, [d] Blessed *is* he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.

[d] Rev. 19. 9.

16 [e] Then said he unto him, A

[e] Matt. 22. 2.

---

7. *a parable.*] *I.e.* a moral aphorism, or rather a lesson drawn from outward manners, but having reference to inward matters (Bengel). The ethical signification of the maxim occurs in verse 11 (Meyer). It is not, as might perhaps be inferred from verse 10, a mere counsel of worldly politeness grounded on selfish motives, but truly a parable teaching the great lesson of humility.

*chief rooms.*] Or "first places." The guests were arranged in a definite order, the precedence accorded to each position being well understood.

12. *Then said he also.*] Jesus now turns from the guests to His host, to teach him a lesson of charity. For this is the real point of the ensuing discourse (verses 12-14), though it deals with the outward forms of society, and (as in the previous "parable") takes the form of a recommendation to pursue the hearer's true and best interest. In the caution "lest they also," &c., there seems to be a delicate irony. In the mention of "the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind," we seem to see an anticipation of the following parable (verses 16-24). In the "resurrection of the just," we do not find any real support of the doctrine of a twofold resurrection; the just are mentioned because their resurrection alone has any bearing upon the question. Meyer, who maintains the reference to a double resurrection, does not connect it with the millenarian doctrine, but with such passages as John v. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 1 Thess. iv. 6; Acts xxiv. 15.

15–21. THE PARABLE OF BIDDEN GUESTS.

15. *Blessed is he.*] The link of connexion is the mention of "the resurrection of the just" at the close of our Lord's previous speech. He was probably understood to mean, that the recompense would take the form of an invitation to the great banquet in the kingdom of the Messiah, at which the faithful Israelite (as it was believed) would sit down in company with the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (compare Matt. viii. 11; ch. xiii. 28). To "eat bread" is merely a Hebrew circumlocution: compare 2 Kings xiii. 9.

16. *Then said he unto him.*] The parable which follows, closely resembles that which occurs in Matt. xxii. 1-14, where see note on the question of the identity or distinctness of the two parables. This was spoken on a totally different occasion, and was a direct answer to the exclamation of the guest (verse 15), who doubtless regarded the great festival in the kingdom of God as open only to Israelites, and, apparently, only to those among them who led creditable lives. Our Lord distinctly declares that the invitation will be extended first to "publicans and sinners," and then to the heathen, in consequence of its careless reception by those to whom it was ori-

certain man made a great supper, and bade many:

17 And sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for all things are now ready.

18 And they all with one *consent* began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it: I pray thee have me excused.

19 And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them: I pray thee have me excused.

20 And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come.

21 So that servant came, and shewed his lord these things. Then the master of the house being angry said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind.

22 And the servant said, Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded, and yet there is room.

23 And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel *them* to come in, that my house may be filled.

24 For I say unto you, That none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.

---

ginally addressed. So far, indeed, it is an expansion of the lesson taught in ch. xiii. 28, 29. Of course it is easy for us to make farther applications of the parable, but this is its original design and scope (verse 16). The first invitation evidently refers to Moses and the Prophets, the second invitation (verse 17) to Christ.

*made.*] Or, as we should probably read, "**was making**," *i.e.* was about to make.

**17.** *sent his servant at supper-time.*] A second invitation is sent immediately before the banquet, as in Matt. xxii. 3, 4, where see notes. The closing words of the invitation, "come, for all things are now ready," suggests the splendid abundance of the feast prepared (Godet).

**18.** *with one consent.*] The word "consent" is supplied by our translators: it might equally have been rendered "with one voice." The meaning is clear in any case: the invited guests were inspired by a common sentiment of dislike against the rich friend who had invited them. This is brought out, too, in the repetition of the words which close the messages of the first and second guest (verses 18, 19): the third (verse 20) is much bolder and more decided.

**18.** *go and see it.*] Rather, "**Go out**" (*i.e.* into the country "**and see it.**"

**21.** *the poor, &c.*] The quality of the persons now invited exactly agrees with those whom our Lord recommends the Pharisee to invite (verse 13). They are the wretched outcasts of society, who are to be found lying in the back streets and lanes, but still *within the city*. Therefore they represent Jews, but Jews of the worst stamp, as they would be thought to be by the persons to whom the parable was addressed. They were the "publicans and sinners" of ch. xv. 1, "the poor" who had the Gospel preached to them (ch. vii. 22), the people who knew not the Law, and whom the Pharisees regarded as "cursed" (John vii. 49). Therefore by those to whom the invitation was originally addressed, we must understand the rulers, doctors of the Law, and Pharisees, the whole of the rich and learned class, the religious world of the time, all (in fact) who enjoyed the greatest religious opportunities.

**23.** *the highways and hedges.*] These are without the city, and this final invitation therefore refers to the calling of the Gentiles. Contrast the expression made use of in verse 21.

*compel them.*] Surely by moral compulsion. Persecution must be sadly in need of an argument, to have taken refuge in this text. The time was short, and the master of the house could not wait; therefore he bade his servant urge these new guests to fill the house without delay (Meyer).

*that my house may be filled.*] This is one great point which St. Paul specially draws from our Lord's teaching: Gentiles would fill up the void left by the faithless Jews: see Rom. xi. 25. Weiss, 'M. E.' p. 473.

**24.** *for I say unto you.*] These words are certainly spoken in the character of the master of the house (De Wette, Meyer, Godet) and not by Jesus in His own person, a supposition which would import into them an unnecessary degree of harshness.

25 ¶ And there went great multitudes with him: and he turned, and said unto them,

26 [f] If any *man* come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.

[f] Matt. 10. 37.

27 And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.

28 For which of you, intending

25–35. WARNINGS TO OUR LORD'S FOLLOWERS.

**25.** *And there went great.*] The mention of the great multitudes, or great crowds, who are here said to have "gone with" Jesus (the original verb is the same which is made use of in reference to His movements through the whole of this period: see note on ch. xiii. 33) forms, in fact, the key to the following discourse (verses 25-35). We are here introduced to a new scene which may be regarded as immediately succeeding that which has just been narrated. After leaving the Pharisee's house Jesus continues His journey, and is followed by great crowds, attracted by his teaching and works. He takes this opportunity of teaching His followers the wide difference between an outward and a real adhesion to Him. The great crowd of followers was not that which he most desired: he sought for true disciples, who should give Him their hearts. In verse 26, He draws a distinction between outward and true discipleship. "If any man come unto me,"—that is the first, the mere visible act of adhesion. But something more is needed to make the follower really a "disciple." Then He places the qualification of a true disciple very high. There must be a willingness to abandon, yea, if need be, to "hate" all that is naturally most dear; and there must be a readiness to undergo all that is most painful and abhorrent to natural feeling, if men are called upon to do so (verse 27). The whole derives additional force and pathos from the position in which the Saviour stood. He was walking at the head of a large company of followers, some sincere, some stable, some the reverse of each; and He was on His way to perform the greatest act of self-abnegation which the world has seen. "The nearer the approach of His own self-sacrifice, the more distinct and the more ideal are the claims which He makes" (Meyer). This short discourse, which hangs together and forms a well-connected whole, consists of three portions: 1st, a statement of the qualifications of a disciple. This is found in substance in the charge to the Twelve, Matt. x. 37, 38. They are not, however, exactly the same in each case. Luke, in particular, has the stronger and more paradoxical expression: "If any man . . . . *hateth* not," &c., the originality of which we cannot doubt. 2ndly. Two short parables, peculiar to St. Luke, and, as De Wette says, "most valuable," enjoining on those who "come to" Christ to be His followers outwardly, the duty of counting the cost, and of duly estimating beforehand the greatness of their task. 3rdly. The practical conclusion from the two parables, is followed by a proverbial expression (also found in the Sermon on the Mount) which will be considered in its place.

**26.** *hate not his father.*] Not to be explained simply "love not less than me:" the expression, strange as it may sound, must have a more definite and positive meaning (Meyer, Godet). The last term in the series of things which the disciple is called to hate ("his own life," *i.e.* animal life—not life in the highest sense, which could have been expressed in the original by a different word; see note on ch. xii. 20) is the key to the meaning of the whole. So far as the love of any earthly object or of any earthly person may come into competition with the love of God, nay more, so far as these things are loved because they form part of "our own life" (the love of kindred being sometimes only selfishness in the second degree) and not "in the Lord," then they ought to be hated and not loved. The "stubborn and rebellious son" under the Law was to be denounced by his parents (Deut. xxi. 18-21): our Lord "simply spiritualises this precept" (Godet). The more forcible expressions in this passage compared with Matt. x. 37 are best accounted for by the different circumstances: these words were spoken with special reference to the severe trials immediately impending. Dean Mansel's note on St. Matthew rests on a different view, maintained by many sound expositors.

**27.** *And whosoever.*] Compare and see note on Matt. x. 38.

**28.** *For which of you.*] The conjunction "for" introduces the ground of the assertion made in the foregoing verse, that "whosoever," &c., "cannot be my disciple." The spirit of this and the following parable is nearly that of the warnings at the outset of this journey, ch. ix. verses 58, 62. It is not necessary to suppose any essential difference between the two similitudes. Our Lord frequently repeated His sayings, and above all His parables, varying the form, in order, if one may

to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have *sufficient* to finish *it?*

29 Lest haply, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish *it*, all that behold *it* begin to mock him,

30 Saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish.

31 Or what king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand?

32 Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and desireth conditions of peace.

33 So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.

34 ¶ [g] Salt *is* good: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned?

[g] Matt. 5. 13.

35 It is neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill; *but* men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

## CHAPTER XV.

1 *The parable of the lost sheep:* 8 *of the piece of silver:* 11 *of the prodigal son.*

THEN drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him.

---

so speak, to drive the lesson home. Still it is allowable in all these cases to endeavour to trace different shades of meaning, and it may be possible in all such cases to find them. Godet regards these two similitudes as denoting respectively, the positive and the negative side of the Christian's work, on the one hand, the *building up* the individual character (compare the frequent use of the term "edify" by St. Paul) and on the other the war against evil in the heart and life. He who attaches himself to Christ as His disciple, must remember from the beginning that he has this double work to perform, and to perform it (as far as may be) thoroughly.

*sitteth not down.*] This denotes careful and exact computation: so in verse 31.

30. *This man.*] Or, almost, "This fellow." There is a touch of contempt in the original phrase, which does not appear in our version.

33. *forsaketh not all.*] The verb here translated "forsaketh" is the same which occurs ch. ix. 61, and is there rendered "bid farewell to." The practical conclusion here stated recalls the teaching of verses 26, 27.

34. *Salt is good.*] Of the two proverbial sayings which close this discourse, the first is found in nearly the same form in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 13, where see note), and also in a different context, a considerably varied form, and a somewhat different sense, in Mark ix. 50. There can be no reasonable doubt that, like other sayings of our Lord, especially such as were thrown into a proverbial form, this was repeated by Him on different occasions. The meaning of the figure, and its connexion with the foregoing warnings, is made manifest by the opening words of the similar passage, Matt. v. 13: "Ye" (*i.e.* the disciples) "are the salt of the earth." It is the office of the follower of Jesus to give savour to the world, and to preserve it from corruption; and this is in itself a good thing, a high and noble calling. But what if they who ought to have this beneficial influence over others have themselves none of those qualities which can enable them to exercise it? This saying, which is used of the Apostles in Matt. v. 13, is here applied to all the disciples, an application peculiarly suitable to the critical period, and not unsuitable at any time, since all who are called to bear, even outwardly, the name of Christ, are, in their degree, the salt of the earth (in the sense in which the expression is explained above) as those who are sent to minister in His name.

35. *It is neither fit.*] Neither fit for the land, to manure it, nor for the dunghill, to be mixed with it. The words are thus explanatory of the saying in the Sermon on the Mount.

*He that hath.*] This is the second of the two proverbial sayings made use of by our Lord, and with it we cannot doubt that He closed the discourse. Compare ch. viii. 8.

### Chap. XV. Three Parables on the Reception of Penitents.

We now enter upon a section containing a series of parables, all of them, with one exception, peculiar to St. Luke, and divided into two portions according to their several main objects. The first portion, consisting of three

2 And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.

3 ¶ And he spake this parable unto them, saying,

4 [h]What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them,

[h] Matt. 18. 12.

parables, treats of God's willingness and desire to win back offenders (verses 3-32): the second, consisting of two parables, treats of the right employment of this world's goods (ch. xvi. 1-31). There is nothing to connect these parables with the foregoing narrative, though we must refer them to the same period to which that belongs. The first three, and the last, were elicited by the opposition of the Pharisees. But there is nothing to indicate the special occasion on which any one of them was spoken, beyond the fact that the three parables in this chapter appear most naturally to have been delivered in connexion; while those of chap. xvi. seem to find a connecting link in the 14th verse of that chapter.

1. *Then drew near unto him.*] Rather, "**Now there were drawing near to him.**" The presence of the publicans in numbers shews that these parables were delivered in or near a city, or place of importance on the borders of a Province, probably near or in Judæa. With this agrees the special mention of scribes and Pharisees, whose indignation was excited by an instance of the habitual willingness of our Lord to converse freely with outcasts of all kinds. The publicans, who, if Jews, were especially odious to their countrymen, and all who were banished from the society of religious people (even, as Olshausen shews from verse 30, for gross and sensual sins) not only came in crowds to hear Christ, but were willingly received and conversed with by Him, even to the extent of being allowed to eat with Him, a special offence in the eyes of strict people, on account of the ceremonial defilement which would be thus contracted: compare Gal. ii. 12, 13.

2. *murmured.*] Or perhaps "**Kept murmuring to one another.**"

4. *What man of you.*] This parable also occurs in a somewhat different form in Matt. xviii. 12, 13 (where see note). Its position in the text is far too appropriate to permit us to suppose that it has been transferred hither from any other part of our Saviour's history. It appears here in a fuller and more perfect form; accompanied also (as in some other cases: Matt. xiii. 44-46: ch. xiii. 18-21) by a similar and complemental parable (verses 8-10) and followed by a third (verses 11-32) to crown the whole series. Postponing for the present the consideration of the Parable of the Prodigal Son, we may examine together the first two parables of the series, as there is a complete parallelism between them. Certain points in these demand our especial notice. First, they are a direct answer to the cavils of the Scribes and Pharisees. They shrank from contact with sinners, not in order to avoid the risk of temptation to themselves, but from a sense of superiority and the fear of contamination. "Stand by for I am holier than thou" expresses their own principle of action, and the ground of their disapprobation of our Saviour's free intercourse with such persons. To this our Saviour answers, in effect, that God does not stand aloof from sinners, nay seeks their recovery, and that this fully justifies His own conduct. Both these parables are introduced in the interrogative form (it does not appear in Matt. xviii. 12) commonly used by our Lord in answering objections (compare ch. xi. 5, 11; ch. xii. 42). The form of expression, in fact, suggests an *argumentum ad hominem*. Then, in verse 4, the word "man" is emphatic: it is not opposed to "woman" in verse 8 (since the original word is the generic, and not the sexual term), but to God. It is as if our Lord had said, "Would not a *man* do all this? How much more God!" and by saying "what man *of you?*" (Compare ch. xi. 11) He turns the argument directly upon His accusers. Then we have to consider the difference of signification, if any, between these two parables. It may not be always necessary to look for a difference of signification in all such cases, but, if any such exists, we should at least expect to find one parable to be the complement of the other. In this case the distinction probably lies in the difference between two aspects of God's love towards sinners; on the one hand, His infinite compassion, and on the other, the exceeding preciousness to Him of every soul (Godet). This difference is worked out in the details of the two parables. First, we have an instance of mercy shewn to a sentient and suffering creature, not so much for the owner's sake (for the loss of one sheep out of a hundred is no such great matter) as for its own; it is sought out with loving care; and tenderly treated (verse 5) and its recovery is made a matter of sympathetic rejoicing. In the second parable, there is no mercy shewn: the "piece of silver," or drachma (about equal to the denarius which, as we know from Matt. xx. 2, was a full day's wage) could not be an object of pity: but it had a value; nd though its intrinsic value was not great, yet its value to its owner (since it was one out of only ten) was very great, greater than that of the lost

doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it?

5 And when he hath found *it*, he layeth *it* on his shoulders, rejoicing.

6 And when he cometh home, he calleth together *his* friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost.

7 I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance.

8 ¶ Either what woman having ten [1]pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she find *it*?

9 And when she hath found *it*, she calleth *her* friends and *her* neighbours together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost.

10 Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

11 ¶ And he said, A certain man had two sons:

[1] *Drachma*, here translated *a piece of silver*, is the eighth part of an ounce, which cometh to seven-pence halfpenny, and is equal to the Roman penny, Matt. 18. 28.

---

sheep in the last parable. Two small shades of difference are especially deserving of notice. The man in the first parable "calls together" his friends: the woman in the second "calls together to herself" hers (for so it should be translated): the former speaks of the "sheep which was lost:" the second of "the piece which I lost." In each of these expressions the feeling of the owner of the lost object is put most prominently forward. Perhaps we may say, in somewhat different words, that the first parable speaks of God's mercy in rescuing sinners, mainly in regard to their own salvation; the second mainly in regard to His own glory. Thirdly, there is a certain amount of difficulty in the practical conclusion drawn from the first parable which does not appear in the corresponding part of the second. (Compare verse 7 with verse 10.) In the latter, the rejoicing which shall take place in heaven over the repenting sinner is simply stated: in the former it is said that it shall exceed that which there is "over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance." In the solution of this difficulty lies one of the keys to the meaning of the two parables. Who are these "just persons?" Or of whom can it be said that they "need no repentance?" Or, lastly, how can it be true (unless we are to regard this as a mere accommodation and as a hyperbolical expression) that God rejoices more over the repenting sinner, than over those who have no need to repent, if any such there be? These questions, after all, really run up into one, and the answer to them all lies in the meaning of the word "just," considered in relation to the cavils of the Scribes and Pharisees. That word has almost a technical sense: compare its use in ch. i. verse 6, where it is explained by "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." It means a careful observance of all that was required from a faithful descendant of Abraham. So the ninety and nine just persons, are those who are righteous according to the legal standard, than which there is, however, something higher, even as there is something more inward. And into this more blessed condition the truly penitent sinner is translated (as the newly found sheep is not left in the wilderness with the rest, but removed to the house of its owner); so that his conversion is more a matter of rejoicing, than the strict observance of the Law by others. It follows that in these two parables, and indeed in the Parable of the Prodigal Son which follows, according to their original intention, the distinction between the ninety-nine sheep, the nine pieces of silver, and the elder son on the one hand, and the lost sheep, the lost piece of silver, and the younger son on the other, does not represent the distinction between the innocent and those who have fallen, or between Jew and Gentile; but between the careful observers of the Law according to the ideal of the Scribes and Pharisees, and the outcasts and offenders of every sort, whose familiar reception by Christ was a ground of offence to them.

*in the wilderness.*] See on ch. i. 80.

*until he find it.*] Mark the diligence of the search: so in verse 8.

**8.** *pieces of silver.*] "**Drachma.**" See on verse 4.

*a candle.*] "**A lamp.**" The houses in the East are commonly without windows.

**9.** *calleth . . . together.*] A difference of reading, affecting the sense but slightly, is found in the best MSS; that followed by the A. V. should be rendered "**calleth together unto herself.**"

**11.** *And he said.*] We come to the Parable of the Prodigal Son, the crown of the parables which we read in this chapter, if not of all

12 And the younger of them said to *his* father, Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth *to me*. And he divided unto them *his* living.

13 And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance with riotous living.

14 And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that land; and he began to be in want.

15 And he went and joined himself to a citizen of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine.

16 And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the

---

parables. Its general meaning, in its original application, will appear from what has been said in the closing part of the first note on verse 4. To interpret it, as is sometimes done, of the calling of the Gentiles, is too narrow; to interpret it (as we, in our practical applications of it, may very well do) simply of God's willingness to receive penitents, finds no room in the explanation for the jealousy of the elder son. Explain it of the relation between strict observers of the Law, and the sinners and outcasts from society who came to Jesus (verse 1), and all is natural and easy. It consists of two distinct portions: in the former the history of the prodigal is traced (verses 11-24): in the latter we see the effect produced by his reception on the elder brother (verses 25-32): the former is the justification of our Lord's own conduct, the latter a censure upon the objections of His opponents.

**12.** *the younger.*] The request of the younger son points to the root of all sin, ever since our first parents desired to be "as gods knowing good and evil." It is the desire to be independent of God, and to be, so to speak, one's own master. It was not covetousness or the love of sinful pleasure which constituted the main temptation to the younger son: it was the desire of independence, his anxiety to be free and live as he pleased. Then, the desire was granted. God lets men fall away from Him if they will: indeed, we read in the parable that the father "divided unto them" (the two sons) "his living:" so God bestows upon every man the mysterious gift of free will, the power of choosing or of refusing His service. The two sons thenceforth represent two classes, but, primarily at least, two classes among those who were within the covenant, the strict and careful observers of the Law, and those who had, so to speak, broken with the Law and who lived in a state of utter self-abandonment. The state of the latter is represented by the "distant country" (literally "country afar off") (verse 13); they were separated from their heavenly Father, and from all that belonged to Him,—"without God in the world."

**13.** *wasted.*] Literally "scattered abroad."

**14.** *And when he.*] The weariness and disgust which is the natural fruit of a sinful course, and which is most heavily felt under the pressure of outward circumstances—the "mighty famine" of the parable (Godet). The verb "he *began*" marks a crisis (Meyer). The "want" marks "the absolute emptiness of a heart which has given up everything to pleasure, and for which there is nothing left but to suffer" (Godet).

**15.** *joined himself.*] The expression in the original is a very strong one. "He clave unto;" *i.e.* he was in a state of absolute dependence upon this person, being, in effect, a slave; a degrading position for a Jew, as we must suppose the "citizen of that country" to be a Gentile, and made doubly degrading by the particular occupation in which he was forced to labour, namely that of feeding unclean animals. The "citizen of that country" may stand as the personification of sin, regarded as a tyrannical power, overruling the free will (that very freedom of action for which the younger son, and those represented by him, have longed so passionately); and in that case the feeding swine will represent that utter moral degradation which is impossible at the beginning of a sinful course, and to which a man is at length forced, as it were, against his will. The unsatisfied desire to feed on the swine's food (verse 16) marks the last stage of this moral degradation in union with the most hopeless misery.

**16.** *the husks.*] "Not the husks and pods of some other fruit, but themselves the fruit of the carob tree. . . . I have seen and tasted them in Calabria, where they are very abundant, and being sold at a very low price are sometimes eaten by the poorer people, but are mainly used for feeding domestic animals. They are also common in Spain, and still more so on the northern coasts of Africa, and in the Levant. They are in shape something like a bean-pod though larger, and curved more into the form of a sickle, thence called 'little horn;' such is the meaning of the

swine did eat: and no man gave unto him.

17 And when he came to himself, he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger!

18 I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee,

19 And am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants.

20 And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him.

21 And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.

22 But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put *it* on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on *his* feet:

23 And bring hither the fatted calf, and kill *it;* and let us eat, and be merry:

24 For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry.

25 Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard musick and dancing.

26 And he called one of the servants, and asked what these things meant.

---

original word:" Trench 'On the Parables,' xxix. *note.*

*and no man gave.*] Or "**And no man would give,**" *i.e.* even of that coarse food. It was for the swine, and therefore too good for the swineherd; this marks the contempt in which even the world holds the utterly abandoned sinner, and probably contains an allusion to the dislike and contempt manifested by the Scribes and Pharisees (verse 2).

**17.** *came to himself.*] Self-recollection is the first step in the way towards recovery.

*How many hired servants.*] Or "**How many hirelings of my father have abundance of bread, while I** (emphatic) **am perishing with hunger.**" The hirelings are mere day-labourers, not inmates of the house like the "servants," *i.e.* slaves, mentioned verses 22-26. The son envies even those among his father's dependants who have the lowest privileges and are the farthest removed from his person.

**18.** *I have sinned.*] Or "**I sinned,**" *i.e.* "in leaving thee:" so verse 21.

**20.** *a great way off.*] Love is quick-sighted, and we may suppose that the father had been daily watching for the prodigal's return. The love of God towards sinful men is the moving cause of their return to Him.

**21.** *Father, I have sinned.*] The prodigal being timid as to his reception, has carefully prepared his confession of sin. The father's love anticipates the confession, but does not prevent its being uttered. The consciousness of his father's love does not permit the offender to forget the deadliness of the offence. This marks the sincerity and depth of his repentance. Nevertheless he is sensible of his father's love and willingness to receive him back into favour and to treat him as a son, therefore the words "make me as one of thy hired servants" are, this time, significantly omitted. Compare Gal. iv. 7.

**22.** *said to his servants.*] The father in the eagerness of his joy, does not answer his son, but at once gives orders to celebrate his return. The forgiveness and restoration of the penitent are complete.

*the best robe.*] Or, **a robe, the best one:** so the best MSS and late critical editions. The robe was not mere clothing, but a long and richly embroidered vestment, such as are kept in store in the East, and are presented to honoured guests. The ring and the shoes (since slaves went barefooted) were signs of a free man.

**23.** *the fatted calf.*] That which, as is usual in an Eastern homestead, was fattened and reserved for some great occasion.

**24.** *And they began.*] This brings us to the second portion of the parable, that which bears most especially on the situation, and contains the reproof to the Scribes and Pharisees: we are now, as it were, placed in the point of view from which they raised the objection recorded verse 2. The discontent of the elder son, of course, represents the feeling out of which that objection sprang.

27 And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound.

28 And he was angry, and would not go in: therefore came his father out, and intreated him.

29 And he answering said to *his* father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment: and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends:

30 But as soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf.

31 And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine.

32 It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.

## CHAPTER XVI.

1 *The parable of the unjust steward.* 14 *Christ reproveth the hypocrisy of the covetous Pharisees.* 19 *The rich glutton, and Lazarus the beggar.*

AND he said also unto his disciples, There was a certain rich man, which had a steward; and

---

**27.** *Thy brother is come.*] Or, "**because**" (*i.e.* it is because) "**thy brother is come.**" The servant, at the close of his speech, translates into dry matter of fact language, the enthusiastic and even poetical utterances of the father (verses 24, 32). "Safe and sound," properly "**in good health,**" is certainly to be taken in its literal and natural sense.

**28.** *intreated him.*] As God in Christ now intreated the Pharisees.

**29.** *these many years.*] Properly, "**so many years I have been serving thee.**" The verb, in the original, is properly applicable to a slave's work. The Pharisees' idea of serving God was that of bond-slaves. The elder son, too, reckons up the years of service, looking for a reward, on the principle of so much pay for so much work. And the service for which he claims a reward, is, at best, only of a negative sort ("neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment," compare Rom. x. 5). There is not a spark of love in all this, and this cold, slavish obedience is sharply contrasted with the loving confidence of the younger son, even as the assumption of perfect obedience is contrasted with his humiliating confession. (Compare ch. xviii. 11, 13.)

**30.** *this thy son.*] Not "my brother," but "thy son," because the elder brother had no love for him: not only that—it is "*this* thy son," the demonstrative pronoun, in the original, marking contempt.

*with harlots.*] A harsh statement, but not differing substantially from that in the narrative, verse 13.

*hast killed.*] Or, "**killest.**"

**31.** *Son, thou art ever.*] Or, "**my child, thou art ever,**" &c. The address "my child" is more tender even than "son." The pronoun, "thou," is emphatic: it stands in opposition to the younger son. There is a slight irony in the address, mingled with much tenderness. There was no need, the father implies, for any special rejoicing over the elder son, because he had always the happiness of being with his father. The son had spoken of this as a bondage (verse 29): the father answers, that it was, in truth, a privilege.

**32.** *this thy brother.*] This is the echo of "this thy son" (see on verse 30). The elder is reminded that the younger son, though formerly, it might be, an object of contempt, is nevertheless his brother. In closing our comments on this wonderful parable, which can never be read without emotion, it will be desirable to notice some points in connexion with the whole series of which it forms the termination. First, it is to be observed that Jesus completely identifies Himself with God in these three parables. It is God who seeks and who receives sinners: but the doctrinal importance of these parables depends upon this being the work of Him by whom they were spoken. What God does, Jesus does; and the action of both is treated as one and the same.

### CHAP. XVI.—1–12. PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD.

**1.** *And he said also.*] The whole of this chapter is occupied by two parables (both peculiar to St. Luke) and certain sayings bearing on their common subject. This subject is the right use of riches in this world, with regard to the prospect of another world. The central lesson of the first parable is given in verse 9. In the other, the misuse of wealth is represented as terribly

punished in the world to come. There can be no doubt that this whole discourse hangs together, and that it was delivered on the same occasion. The doubt is, whether it has any connexion with the foregoing series of parables. The first words of verse 1 would certainly lead us to suppose that it was delivered on the same occasion, and in the presence of the same circle of hearers (compare verse 14), as that which precedes it. This is allowed by Meyer, Olshausen, Oosterzee, and Godet. Assuming a connexion of time, place, and persons, it is still an open question whether any inward connexion of subjects exists. We should perhaps say, with Meyer, that although there is no direct and immediate connexion between the subjects of ch. xv. and ch. xvi. respectively, it was natural that our Lord should speak of the right and wrong uses of riches in relation both to the Pharisees "who were covetous" (verse 14), and to the Publicans who amassed ill-gotten wealth. Nevertheless the Pharisees stand in the background at present, the parable having been spoken directly to the disciples. (Compare verse 1 with verse 14.) No part of the New Testament has been more thoroughly discussed, or has received a greater variety of interpretations than the Parable of the Unjust Steward. Its difficulties "multiply rather than disappear, the closer the parable is searched into." (Trench,—'On the Parables,' xxv.,—in whose Commentary a collection of various explanations will be found.) It is necessary first to see exactly what the story is. The rich man is plainly a wealthy landowner. He manages his estates through a steward entrusted with large discretionary powers, therefore not a slave but a free man. The steward had not enriched himself at his master's expense, but had squandered his goods. The master, hearing an evil report of the steward, pronounces a sentence of dismissal. This sentence is clearly absolute, not a mere threat. The steward has recourse to an ingenious expedient. He calls together his master's debtors: two only are mentioned, but they are given as specimens. (Compare ch. xix. 13, 16, 18, 20.) Now, what were these debtors? Were they tenants, or traders? The former is maintained by Oosterzee and Stein; the debt in that case being not the annual rent, but the deficit in former payments; the latter by Meyer (who observes that the original term is especially used of borrowers) and by Trench and Godet, who regard them as purchasers of produce from the rich man's estates, who had not paid. According to this view the bills are obligations, notes of hand (as we should say) left in the hands of the steward as a security for payment. The steward hands over to each debtor his obligation, bidding him to alter the sum to a lower figure and to return to him the document. What then is the meaning of the parable? Passing by certain ingenious interpretations which we have no space to notice here, and most of which will be found in Trench, we shall find that the best expositors practically agree in the main point of the interpretation. As the steward exercised skill and judgment in the use of the means which had been placed in his hands, so as to secure a refuge when he should be driven from his present position,—so the disciple of Christ should make such a use of the gifts of fortune with which God has blessed him, as to secure, when he "fails" (*i.e.* dies) an eternal place in God's heavenly kingdom. He is bidden to emulate the prudent foresight of the unjust steward (verse 8), especially in the disposal of his worldly goods (verse 9). We must now consider some details of the parable. Whom are we to understand by the rich man and the steward respectively? In the narrative they must be understood in the literal sense, but in the application the former undoubtedly represents the Possessor of all things; so it is explained by Trench, Oosterzee, Godet and Alford: whereas the steward denotes all those whom He puts in any position of responsibility whether in temporal or in spiritual concerns, more especially the disciple of Christ. We may see in the sentence of dismissal the certainty of death (compare verse 9) when all things committed to us here will pass for ever away from us. Beyond this, we need not press these details, if we see in the relation of the steward to his master that of man to God, the comparison (as De Wette and others point out) fails, in that the steward, who is commended, is unfaithful in the care of his lord's goods. But, as Trench well observes (quoting a weighty passage from Hammond) it is only in the case of God and His true servants that there can be a perfect unity of interest between master and steward. One further point of detail must be considered here. Who are the debtors who are to be obliged and made friends of, and how are they able to receive into everlasting habitations? For, it must be observed that there exists a complete parallelism, between the closing words of verse 4 and those of verse 9. Accordingly, we cannot be content to regard the "they may receive" of verse 9 as impersonal, or to interpret it (with Meyer, who compares verse 22), of the angels, since these cannot be made friends by any act of beneficence towards them. There can be no doubt that the friends whom we are exhorted to conciliate by a prudent use of the "mammon of unrighteousness," are the poor, and all who stand in need of assistance. But the question remains how these can be said to receive into everlasting habitations those who

the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods.

2 And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward.

3 Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do? for my lord taketh away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed.

4 I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses.

5 So he called every one of his lord's debtors *unto him*, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord?

6 And he said, An hundred [1]measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty.

7 Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred [1]measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write fourscore.

8 And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done

[1] The w... *Batus*, the m... ...na con- tained ...nine g- lons thr... quarts.

[1] The w... here tr... ...measure in the or- ginal co- taineth about ...

---

have shewn them kindnesses and relieved their necessities here on earth. Trench observes that the key to this difficulty is found in Matt. xxv. 35-40, where our Lord altogether identifies Himself with those to whom for His sake kindness of any kind has been shewn on earth.

*unto his disciples.*] Not to the Apostles only, but to the general circle of His ordinary hearers, or rather perhaps, as Trench considers, to "the whole body of those who had attached themselves to be taught of Him, whom His word had found out in the deep of their spirits, and who having left this world's service, had decidedly passed over into the ranks of His people. To them, to the 'disciples' so understood, the parable was addressed and for them meant." Nevertheless, it appears from verse 14 that the parable was spoken in the presence of the Pharisees, doubtless those before whom the three foregoing ones were delivered. Our Saviour on other occasions in speaking before a mixed assemblage turned first to one and then to another class among His hearers. (Compare ch. xii. 1, 16, 22, 54.)

*accused.*] The original word is commonly rendered "slander," but it does not necessarily convey the meaning of false accusation.

*wasted.*] Literally, "scattered" or "squandered," as in ch. xv. 13, where the same word is used in the original.

**2.** *How is it, &c.*] Or, "**what is this that I hear of thee?**" "The rich man speaks as of something which he had never expected. God trusts man." (Bengel.)

*give an account.*] Or, "**render the account.**"

*mayest.*] Or, "**canst:**" the thing is impossible.

**3.** *taketh away.*] Or, "**is taking away,**" is immediately about to do so.

*I cannot dig.*] Rather, "**I have not strength to dig.**"

**4.** *I am resolved, &c.*] Or, "**I know what I will do.**" He hits upon a device at once.

**5.** *every one.*] Rather, "**each one.**"

**6.** *measures.*] Or, "**baths.**" See Josephus, 'Ant.' xviii. 6, 3. The amount, like that mentioned in the following verse, is very large, and best agrees with the supposition that the debtors were traders who had made purchases from the rich man's estates.

*Take thy bill.*] The note of hand which the steward had kept among his papers, and now returns to the debtor to be altered.

*quickly.*] This seems to shew that the transaction was secret, and the expression used in verse 5 ("everyone," or "each one," in the original it is so more decidedly) appears to shew that the debtors were dealt with separately and privately.

**7.** *measures.*] Or, "**Cors.**" See 1 Kings iv. 32.

**8.** *the lord.*] Not the Lord Jesus, but the lord of the steward, whose commendation forms part of the parable. So it is used ch. xii. 42; xiv. 23; with reference in each case to an earthly master who in each case is made to represent our heavenly master.

*commended the unjust steward.*] Literally, "commended the steward of unrighteousness," not "for his unrighteousness" (as Schleiermacher), but a Hebraising periphrasis of which our Version gives the fair equivalent. (So "the mammon of unrighteousness," verse 9, identical with "the unrighteous mammon," verse 11; "the unjust judge," literally

wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.

9 And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the [1]mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye

teen bushels and a pottle.
[1] Or, *riches*.

---

"the judge of unrighteousness," ch. xviii. 6; and elsewhere in the New Testament.) Much difficulty has been raised about this commendation of the unjust steward, who, though commended by *his* (not *the*) lord, is still set up as an example for Christians to follow; and various expedients have been resorted to in order to get rid of this difficulty. Let it be observed in the first place that this is not the only instance in which our Lord has made wrong action the medium of conveying spiritual lessons: the Parable of the Unjust Judge (ch. xviii. 1-8) is a case in point: so, in fact, is that of the man who finds the treasure in a field, and conceals the fact, before purchasing the field (Matt. xiii. 44). It is evident that the praise is here bestowed upon the steward, not for his dishonesty, but for his quick intelligence. "Yet at the same time, few will deny that the praise has something perplexing in it—though rather from the liability of the passage to abuse, unguarded as at first sight it appears (though it is not really so, for see verse 11, which should never be disconnected from the parable), than from its not being capable of a fair explanation. The explanation is clearly this: the man's deed has two sides on which it may be contemplated—one, the side of its dishonesty, upon which it is most blameworthy; the other, the side of its prudence, its foresight, upon which, if it be not particularly praiseworthy, yet it supplies a sufficient *analogon* to a Christian virtue—one which should be abundantly, but is only too weakly, found in most followers of Christ—to make it the ground of an exhortation and rebuke to these, just as any of the deeds of bold bad men have a side, that is the side of their boldness and decision, upon which they rebuke the doings of the weak and vacillating good. . . . . We may disentangle a bad man's energy from his ambition, so far, at least, as to contemplate them apart from one another, and may then praise the one and condemn the other. Even so, our Lord in the present case disentangles the steward's dishonesty from his prudence: the one, of course, can only have His earnest rebuke, the other may be usefully extolled for the purpose of provoking His people by emulation to a like prudence, which yet should be at once a holy prudence, and a prudence employed about things of far higher and more lasting importance." (Trench 'On the Parables,' § xxv.)

*wisely.*] Or, "**prudently.**" The word is specially used of sagacity in reference to the choice of means, whatever may be the object contemplated. Its morality depends upon the nature of that object. Compare with this commendation of a faithless steward by a worldly master that which our Lord bestows upon a steward who should be at once faithful and prudent, ch. xii. 42, where the same word is used.

*children of this world.*] Compare ch. xx. 34; those whose thoughts, hopes, and principles of action are limited to the things of earth.

*wiser in their generation.*] Or, "**more prudent in relation to their own generation**" (or "kindred"). *I.e.* Worldly men are more prudent and far-seeing in their dealings with their own generation (with those who are like-minded with themselves) than God's servants are with regard to their fellow-servants. Let these seek so to act in all their relations with one another as to secure for themselves an eternal reward.

*children of light.*] Compare John xii. 36; Eph. v. 8; 1 Thess. v. 5.

9. *And I say unto you.*] Both the pronouns are emphatic; "I" in opposition to "the lord," and "you" in opposition to "the steward" (Meyer).

*make to yourselves friends.*] The friends are the poor, and all who stand in need: see on verse 1, where this verse is explained. Does this exhortation clash with the Pauline doctrine of Justification? No more so than Matt. xxv. 31-46, or, in fact, than any other passage in which God is spoken of as about to reward men according to their works. On the other hand, "no thought can be better fitted than that of this parable, on the one hand to overthrow the idea of any kind of merit attaching to almsgiving, (for what merit can there be in giving of that which is another's?) and on the other to encourage us to the practice of that excellence which assures us of friends and protectors, for so grave a crisis as that of our entrance into the world to come." Besides, our friends, as Oosterzee observes, only receive us into, and do not give us, everlasting habitations.

*of the mammon of unrighteousness.*] Rather "**out of**" (*i.e.* "by means of") "**the mammon of unrighteousness,**" or (compare and see on verse 8; and compare verse 11), "**the unrighteous mammon.**" Mammon is an Aramaic word signifying wealth (not, as has often been said, a god of wealth), of which, by a kind of personification, it is used

fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.

10 He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much.

11 If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous [1]mammon, who will commit to your trust the true *riches?*

12 And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?

13 ¶ [a]No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the

[1] Or, *riches*

[a] Matt. 6. 24.

verse 13 and Matt. vi. 24 (where see note). The question arises, why wealth is termed the unrighteous mammon. "The epithet 'unrighteousness' would signify merely, according to several interpreters, that the acquisition of fortune is most commonly stained with sin;" according to Bleek and others, that sin easily attaches to the administration of these goods. But in this case these are merely accidental circumstances: the context leads us to a more satisfactory explanation. The ears of Jesus must have been repeatedly shocked by the kind of rashness by which men speak without hesitation of '*my* fortune,' '*my* land,' '*my* house.' He, who felt keenly the dependence of man upon God, perceived that there was in this feeling of property a sort of usurpation, a forgetfulness of the real Owner; in hearing such language He seemed to see the tenant changing into the master. It is this sin, of which the natural man is so deeply unconscious, which He strips throughout this parable, and which He especially marks in the phrase "the unrighteous mammon." It is therefore wrong to see here, with De Wette, the Tübingen School, Renan, &c., a condemnation of property *as such*. The sin consists, not in being the steward of God, but in forgetting it: see the following parable" (Godet). Others have seen in "the unrighteous mammon" the deceitfulness and transitoriness of this world's goods, as opposed to the "true riches" to be enjoyed in everlasting habitations. On the whole, we are probably to understand by the unrighteousness of mammon, the evil which in so many ways attaches to wealth, either to its acquisition, or in the way of the manifold temptations to which it ministers (compare 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10) and which make it difficult for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God (ch. xviii. 24, 25).

*fail.*] *I. e.* "die."

*everlasting habitations.*] Literally "**the everlasting tabernacles,**" or tents. The tent is of its own nature a temporary habitation (compare 2 Cor. v. 1, where it is contrasted with a "house.") Therefore the word "everlasting" stands here in marked contrast to the word "tabernacles," or temporary habitations, apparently with the object of contrasting the lasting character of the heavenly mansions with the temporary refuge which the steward in the parable had been securing for himself (Trench).

**10.** *He that is, &c.*] This verse really serves to limit and explain the meaning of the foregoing parable. It shews that although the dishonest act of the steward is (as regarded from one point of view) set up as a model for us, yet it is fidelity and not unfaithfulness to our Master which is commended: see note above on verse 8, and below on verse 13. Among God's servants he acts most prudently for his own interest, who best serves his master. The contrast between the "least" and the "much" in this verse is identical with the contrasts between "the unrighteous mammon" and "that which is another man's" on the one hand, and "the true riches" and "that which is your own" in verses 11, 12. Compare ch. xix. 17.

**11.** *the true riches.*] Properly "**the true**" mammon. Compare Matt. vi. 20.

**12.** *another man's.*] Rather, "**another's,**" reminding us that we are only stewards of God's gifts.

**13.** *No servant.*] Substantially the same with a saying which occurs in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 24, where see note). It is probable that the saying, which has somewhat of a proverbial cast, was repeated more than once. Certainly it attaches itself very naturally to the Parable of the Unjust Steward, both by the mention of "mammon," and by making use of the image of serving a master. "In verse 13 He further states what the fidelity is, which in this stewardship is required: it is a choosing of God instead of mammon for our lord. For in this world we are in the condition of servants from whom two masters are claiming allegiance—one is God, man's rightful lord; the other is this unrighteous mammon, which was given to be our servant, to be wielded by us in God's interests, and, itself to be considered by us as something slight, transient, and another's—but which has, in a sinful world, erected itself into a lord, and now demands obedience from us, which if we yield, we can be no longer faithful servants and stewards of

one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

14 And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things: and they derided him.

15 And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.

16 [b]The law and the prophets *were* until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it.

17 [c]And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.

18 [d]Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from *her* husband committeth adultery.

[b] Matt. 11. 12.
[c] Matt. 5. 18.
[d] Matt. 5. 32.

---

God. . . . Therefore, these two lords having characters so different, and giving commands so opposite, it will be impossible to reconcile their service (James iv. 4): one must be despised if the other is held to; the only faithfulness to the one is to break with the other; '*Ye cannot serve God and mammon.*' Such appears to me to be the connexion between verse 13 and the preceding verses, and between the whole of these verses and the parable of which they surely are intended to give the moral" (Trench).

*serve.*] *I.e.* Properly "**be the slaves of,**" a rendering, which gives much greater force to the maxim.

**14.** *And the Pharisees.*] The short discourse which introduces the Parable of the Rich Man appears to consist of detached sayings with no internal bond of union. The fact is, that the connexion does not lie on the surface, and we are probably to regard these apparently detached sayings as brief notes or heads of a continuous discourse. So Godet, who shews that the apparent want of connexion is an evidence of their authenticity: a forger would have taken pains to blend his materials into a harmonious whole. The real connexion appears to be of the following kind. The Pharisees pretended to a high standard of legal holiness, and saw no inconsistency between this profession and their avaricious practice. Our Lord's teaching on the use of worldly goods, which was at variance with their own notions, did not disturb their consciences, it simply seemed to them absurd, and they gave vent to this feeling in mockery (verse 14). Our Lord then goes on to distinguish between merely outward and legal righteousness, and true inward righteousness, which approves itself to God (verse 15). He declares that the reign of outward legal righteousness is at an end since the proclamation of the spiritual kingdom of God by John the Baptist (verse 16). Nevertheless, though the outward scaffolding of the legal system is to pass away, the inward principle of the Law is eternal (verse 17). Of this a special example is given, to shew that the moral law is indissoluble, and is even more strict than the Law of Moses, which was its outward expression (verse 18; compare Matt. v. 17-48). Our Lord then passes to the Parable of the Rich Man, in which, as in that of the Unjust Steward, He teaches the right use of riches, with a view to our prospects of eternity, and at the close of which he reverts to what He has said concerning the unfailing obligation of the Law.

**17.** *And.*] Rather, "**but.**" The particle is decidedly adversative: although the kingdom of God is now preached instead of the Law and the Prophets, yet the Law shall not fail. Compare Matt. v. 17, 18, and the illustrations of the difference between the old Law and our Lord's spiritual interpretation of it in Matt. v. 21-48.

*tittle.*] Compare and see note on Matt. v. 18. In this passage Marcion substituted "my words" for "the law:" a reading evidently determined by his peculiar doctrines, but it has been adopted by Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* pp. 556 and 574, note 1) on the ground that the received reading is scarcely reconcileable with the context; but see the following note.

**18.** *Whosoever.*] There can be little doubt that this verse is the condensation of a longer discourse, in which our Lord gave an example of the contrast between the eternal Law of morality and the external Law, by which it had been hitherto taught to the Jews. The contrast is stated more clearly in Matt. v. 31, 32 (in the discourse on the permanence of the Law), as well as in Matt. xix. 9, in answer to the Pharisees. Olshausen (comparing Rom. vii. 1-4) sees in this verse an additional assurance of the permanence of the Law, interpreting it allegorically of spiritual adultery.

19 ¶ There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day:

20 And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores,

21 And desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores.

22 And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried;

23 And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.

24 And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and

---

19–31. THE PARABLE OF LAZARUS.

**19.** *There was, &c.*] This parable also is peculiar to St. Luke. It falls naturally into its place here. In it, our Lord advances a step beyond the teaching of the Parable of the Unjust Steward, in so far as it condemns not merely the positive misuse, but also the careless and thoughtless use, of this world's goods. It is not necessary to see in it (with De Wette) an expansion of the thought, "blessed are the poor," and "woe to the rich." It is true that Lazarus is set forth merely as a poor man, and that nothing is said of his character. This, however, must be inferred from his reward. The Rich Man is the true centre of the picture, and the prominent contrast is that between his selfish and thoughtless use of his abundance, coupled with his negative cruelty towards the beggar who lay at his gate, and his miserable doom. The main points taught by the parable are, 1st. The uncertainty and transitoriness of earthly blessings; 2ndly. The responsibility of rich men not only for what they do, but for what they do not do, with their wealth; and 3rdly. The supremacy of the Law of God as a guide to eternal life. We must also remark the light which is thrown upon the condition of departed spirits in the intermediate state.

*purple and fine linen.*] The outer garment of dyed wool, the inner of fine white linen from Egypt. The splendid and joyous daily life of the Rich Man is briefly sketched in this verse.

**20.** *And there was.*] Or, as we ought apparently to read, "**but a certain beggar, by name Lazarus, lay at his gate,**" or "porch."

*Lazarus.*] Or, "Eleazar," *i.e.* God-help, a symbol of his (humanly speaking) destitute condition. It is here a symbolical name, suitable to a parable; but it cannot but have occurred to our Lord's hearers that the name was borne by one whom Jesus loved, more especially in connexion with the raising of that loved one, which must have taken place about this time, most probably, as Resch seems to prove, a very short time previously: see note on ch. ix. 51.

**21.** *And desiring.*] Closely connected with "full of sores." The two participles, in the original, give the reasons for laying Lazarus at the gate.

*the crumbs which fell.*] He did not seek for alms at the Rich Man's hands, merely for the casual overflowings of his abundance.

*moreover the dogs.*] Or, "**but even the dogs.**" This has been regarded as an alleviation of his suffering, or as intended to place the cruelty of the Rich Man in strong relief by contrasting it with the way in which the very dogs treated the beggar (De Wette, Bleek): but it seems rather meant to mark the utter abandonment and helplessness of Lazarus, who was thrown down before the Rich Man's gate in such a feeble condition that even the wandering dogs which infest an Eastern city licked his sores without being driven away.

**22.** *And it came, &c.*] The scene suddenly changes to the other world. The burial of Lazarus is not mentioned: it was not worthy of record in itself, like the splendid obsequies of the Rich Man.

*and was carried by the angels.*] The office here assigned to angels accords with all other notices of their ministrations to heirs of salvation: cf. Matt. xxiv. 31; Mark xiii. 27; Heb. i. 14.

*Abraham's bosom.*] The faithful children of Abraham are regarded as gathered up, after death, into their great father's arms. (Compare 4 Macc. xiii. 16.)

**23.** *hell.*] "**Hades;**"—"Sheol," or the place of departed spirits, good and bad alike, which is however divided into two portions by a great and impassable gulf.

*afar off.*] Or, "**from afar;**" *i.e.* from the other side of the great gulf.

**24.** *cried.*] "**Cried aloud,**" being at a distance.

*Father Abraham.*] The Rich Man rested

send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.

25 But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.

26 And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that *would come* from thence.

27 Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house:

28 For I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.

29 Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.

30 And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent.

31 And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

## CHAPTER XVII.

*1 Christ teacheth to avoid occasions of offence. 3 One to forgive another. 6 The power of faith. 7 How we are bound to God, and not he to us. 11 He healeth ten lepers. 22 Of the kingdom of God, and the coming of the Son of man.*

THEN said he unto the disciples, [a]It is impossible but that

[a] Matt. 18. 7.

his hopes on his descent from Abraham, who acknowledges the relationship in his reply (verse 25). Compare ch. iii. 8; John viii. 33.

**25.** *receivedst thy good things.*] *I. e.* "didst receive to the full thy good things" (literally "*the* good things" which were to come to thee, or, which alone thou caredst for). Compare ch. vi. 24.

*evil things.*] Rather, **"his evil things."** There is a complete parallel between the history of the Rich Man and that of Lazarus. Each has completely exhausted his allotted share of blessings or of sufferings in this life. We are not, however, to suppose (as it has been supposed by commentators who are anxious to see imperfect moral teaching in the Gospel) that the Rich Man is condemned on account of his wealth, or the beggar saved because of his earthly sufferings. To understand the parable thus is to miss its fine point. See note on verse 27.

**26.** *gulf.*] Or "chasm."

*fixed.*] Hath been firmly fixed, so that it is irremovable as well as impassable.

*so that.*] **"In order that they who would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that they who are there may not cross over unto us from thence."** The "great gulf" is designed as a barrier.

**27.** *I pray thee.*] The Rich Man submits to the decision: but he prays that a special warning may be sent to his five brethren who are still living. The request here ascribed to the Rich Man is plainly inconsistent with the supposition that the parable is intended to teach the condemnation of riches themselves, not of the misuse of riches: the five brethren are in danger of being condemned, not for being rich, but for impenitence. This part of the parable leads us back to the supremacy and permanence of the Law, insisted on in verse 17. Those who have and use the guidance which God has given them, do not need any startling dispensation from Him to convince them of sin or to lead them to repentance. Is there here any allusion to the Resurrection of Christ? The words are no doubt singularly applicable to the incredulity of the Jews. But He was never manifested to them after His Resurrection, so that we are not to suppose any direct reference to it (Godet). Even De Wette says that one cannot help admiring the purity of the tradition followed by the Evangelist, as shewn by its so nearly touching, and yet keeping clear of, the Resurrection of Christ. See the following note.

**31.** *neither will, &c.*] **"They will not be persuaded, even if one rise from the dead."** The conduct of the Pharisees after the raising of Lazarus supplies the best commentary upon this great saying. The connexion between that event and the whole parable is strongly maintained by some able critics, and indeed forces itself upon our minds.

### CHAP. XVII.—1–10. WARNINGS TO THE DISCIPLES.

**1.** *Then said he.*] Or, **"but he said"**

offences will come: but woe *unto him*, through whom they come!

2 It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones.

3 ¶ Take heed to yourselves: [b] If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him.

[b] Matt. 18. 21.

4 And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him.

5 And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith.

6 [c] And the Lord said, If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and be thou planted in the sea; and it should obey you.

[c] Matt. 17. 20.

7 But which of you, having a servant plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat?

8 And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?

9 Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not.

10 So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.

11 ¶ And it came to pass, as he went to Jerusalem, that he passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee.

---

This marks the transition from the address to the Pharisees to a series of sayings spoken to the disciples. Those which immediately follow (verses 1-4) are the condensation of a discourse given fully in Matt. xviii. 6-35, where see notes. It is certainly in its true place in the text, having been connected with the mention of the little child placed in the midst (compare ch. ix. 46-48) in the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark (ix. 36-48).

*offences.*] The saying is general, but, like most utterances of our Lord, was probably elicited by actual circumstances; in this case most probably by the behaviour of the Pharisees (cf. ch. xvi. 14), which had given occasion to the preceding discourse. Want of charity is the sin against which the disciples are specially warned in the words spoken immediately afterwards. See note on Mark ix. 50.

**3.** *against thee.*] These words are omitted here by the best MSS and late Editors. They may have been taken from St. Matt. xviii. 16, or from the verse following. In the former case they would support the received text in St. Matthew.

**5.** *Increase our faith.*] Literally, "**add unto us faith.**" The figurative exhortation to faith occurs in a somewhat different form twice in St. Matthew's Gospel (xvii. 20; xxi. 21, where see notes) and once in St. Mark's (xi. 22, 23).

**6.** *as a grain of mustard seed.*] *I. e.* the smallest quantity: compare Matt. xiii. 32.

*sycamine tree.*] See Tristram 'N. H. B.,' p. 396. The sycamine, which differs from the sycamore, elsewhere mentioned, is the well-known black mulberry tree, which is still known in Greece by the name "Sycamonia." It belongs to the same natural order as the Fig-tree.

**7.** *But which of you.*] That which follows (verses 7-10) is peculiar to St. Luke. It is of the nature of a parable (compare ch. xii. 3-39, 42-48) teaching the great truth that human works give men no claim on God, and that the highest earthly excellence is merely the performance of an obligation. The "servant" here is a slave, as usual in the New Testament: this gives additional force to the similitude. The connexion with the foregoing sayings does not appear on the surface: but a warning against reliance on gifts as indicating personal qualifications may have been specially needed after the promise recorded in the preceding verse.

**10.** *unprofitable.*] Not useless, but as doing nothing beyond our bare duty.

11–19. THE TEN LEPERS.

**11.** *as he went.*] "**As he was going.**" We are here again recalled to the fact of the journey towards Jerusalem (compare and see notes on ch. ix. 51). The miracle is peculiar to St. Luke. It is doubtless here in its proper place.

*through the midst of.*] Or, as the words most probably mean, "**between,**" *i.e.* "along

12 And as he entered into a certain village, there met him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off:

13 And they lifted up *their* voices, and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us.

14 And when he saw *them*, he said unto them, [d] Go shew yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed.

15 And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God,

16 And fell down on *his* face at his feet, giving him thanks: and he was a Samaritan.

17 And Jesus answering said, Were there not ten cleansed? but where *are* the nine?

18 There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger.

19 And he said unto him, Arise, go thy way: thy faith hath made thee whole.

20 ¶ And when he was demanded

---

the frontiers of." St. Luke, who is very sparing in geographical notices, has one in this place which presents great difficulties, whatever view is taken by commentators. The notice of Samaria before Galilee is perplexing, being the opposite direction of a route toward Jerusalem. The question as to the *terminus à quo* of this journey is by no means easily answered. From St. John's Gospel we learn that after the raising of Lazarus, which had probably occurred previously, our Lord went to Ephraim and remained there some time: the site of Ephraim is uncertain, but it was probably towards the north-eastern frontier of Judæa; see note at the end of Matt. xviii.; and compare an article by Clermont Ganneau, 'Journal asiatique,' 1877, p. 494. If then we admit so far the very probable view advocated by Resch, we may further assume that on leaving that district our Lord would actually pass northwards, along the frontier of Samaria towards Galilee, on his way to Peræa, where He certainly was when He set out for the last time on His way to Jerusalem.

**12.** *stood afar off.*] "He is unclean: he shall dwell alone: without the camp shall his habitation be" (Lev. xiii. 46). If we suppose the miracle to have occurred on the borders of Samaria and Galilee, we can understand how Jews and Samaritans, who would not otherwise have associated with each other, being now driven from human habitations, banded together in one company.

**14.** *Go shew yourselves.*] As directed in the law of leprosy (Lev. xiv. 2-32).

**17.** *Were there not ten cleansed?*] Rather, "**were not the ten** (*i.e.* all of them) **cleansed?**" (the last being the emphatic word). "Did not the cure operate on all alike?"

**18.** *stranger.*] Properly "one of another race" (*i.e.* not an Israelite). The religion of the Samaritans was partly Jewish; but their blood was wholly heathen. St. Luke, who alone gives us the Parable of the Good Samaritan (ch. x. 30-37) is the only Evangelist who records the faith and love of the Samaritan leper. It was in accordance with the catholic tendency of his own and St. Paul's teaching to bring these incidents prominently forward.

**19.** *thy faith hath made thee whole.*] Or, "**Thy faith hath saved thee.**" Compare Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 34; x. 52; ch. vii. 50; viii. 48; xviii. 42.

### 20–37. On the Coming of the Kingdom of God.

**20.** *And when he was demanded.*] The following discourse was evidently delivered immediately after the events just recorded, and, as the presence of the Pharisees shews, either in Judæa or Peræa. We can best understand the mutual bearings of its several parts, by recollecting what kind of kingdom the Pharisees looked for: it was to be an outward manifestation of God's sovereignty in the world, in which a splendid position of supremacy would be assigned to their own nation. They had not learned to distinguish between the impending establishment of a spiritual kingdom, and the final manifestation of a visible kingdom, which is taught throughout the New Testament. Accordingly Jesus answers the Pharisees by turning their minds from the outward to the inward kingdom which He came to set up (verses 20, 21); but He comforts His disciples by pointing to the visible coming of the kingdom which was as yet in the distant future (verses 22-37). And, with reference to this, He tells them that their attitude and that of the church must be one of patient expectation (verses 22-24) and earnest prayer (ch. xviii. 1-8), since the coming of the Son of Man, though distant (verse 25) is sudden (verse 24): that He will find men unprepared, engaged in the ordinary business of life,

of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not [1]with observation:

[1] Or, *with outward shew.*

21 Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is [1]within you.

[1] Or, *among you.*

22 And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see *it*.

23 [e]And they shall say to you, See here; or, see there: go not after *them*, nor follow *them*.

[e] Matt. 24. 23.

24 For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one *part* under heaven, shineth unto the other *part* under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day.

25 But first must he suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation.

26 [f]And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man.

[f] Gen.

27 They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all.

28 [g]Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded;

[g] Gen.

29 But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed *them* all.

---

mingled together, good and bad alike (34-37): wherefore men must be ready at any moment to obey the call, even at the price of all that is esteemed most precious (verses 31-33). Certain features of this discourse also appear in the great prophecy in Matt. xxiv.; ch. xxi. 8-36. The passage now before us, however, contains no features specially applicable to the destruction of Jerusalem. It is purely eschatological. The only apparent exception (verse 31) will be noticed in its place.

*demanded of the Pharisees.*] The question was evidently put insidiously, with a view of eliciting an answer damaging to our Lord's influence: see the statement in ch. xi. 53, 54, which applies to the whole of this period. That the tone was contemptuous is highly probable, cf. xvi. 14.

*cometh not.*] *I.e.* it is not its nature or character to come with observation: so in the next verse, "the kingdom of God *is* within you." The present tense does not in either case express any particular relation of time.

*with observation.*] Not, as in the marginal rendering, "with outward shew," but in such a manner as to be the subject of observation: it comes unobserved, unmarked, so that men cannot say of it, "Lo here! or, lo there!" The Greek word generally implies captious, or uncandid observation, cf. ch. xx. 20, and is apparently used in express reference to the course pursued by the Pharisees.

**21.** *within you.*] The words might also be rendered "among you." In that case our Lord would mean the kingdom of God is *already* in the midst of you (compare ch. xi. 20). They are thus taken by Euthymius, Bornemann, Meyer, and the majority of modern interpreters. Olshausen, and Godet (after Chrysostom and Theophylact) maintain the translation "within you," as adapted to the inferential character of the clause "the kingdom . . . . cometh not with observation, *for* it is *within* you." On the other hand the following exhortations to the disciples refer to a visible coming.

**22.** *one of the days of the Son of man.*] Either one of the days which He passed with them on earth, or else, one of those still more blessed days which should follow His return. Probably both are intended, but principally the latter. Regret merges into longing hope. The word "one" is emphatic:—"even a single day." The virtual parallel is Matt. xxiv. 21, 22.

**23.** *they shall say.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. xxiv. 23-27. There will be many false reports and unrealised expectations of the return of Christ: His final manifestation will be sudden and universal.

**25.** *But first.*] The Son of Man must be taken away before He can return. Therefore the *visible* kingdom of God, of which He speaks here, belongs as yet to the future.

*this generation.*] *I.e.* the Jews of that day.

**26.** *And as it was.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. xxiv. 37-39.

**28.** *the days of Lot.*] Gen. xix. This second example is peculiar to St. Luke. It forms a connecting link with the exhortation which follows.

30 Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.

31 In that day, he which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away: and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back.

32 [h]Remember Lot's wife.

33 [i]Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it.

34 [k]I tell you, in that night there shall be two *men* in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left.

35 Two *women* shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

36 [l]Two *men* shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

37 And they answered and said unto him, [l]Where, Lord? And he said unto them, Wheresover the body *is*, thither will the eagles be gathered together.

[h] Gen. 19. 26.
[i] Matt. 16. 25.
[k] Matt. 24. 40.
[l] This 36th verse is wanting in most of the Greek copies.
[l] Matt. 24. 28.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

3 *Of the importunate widow.* 9 *Of the Pharisee and the publican.* 15 *Children brought to Christ.* 18 *A ruler that would follow Christ, but is hindered by his riches.* 28 *The reward of them that leave all for his sake.* 31 *He foresheweth his death,* 35 *and restoreth a blind man to his sight.*

AND he spake a parable unto them *to this end*, that men ought [a]always to pray, and not to faint;

[a] 1 Thess. 5. 17.

---

31. *In that day.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. xxiv. 17, 18. It has been objected that this representation, however suitable to the fall of Jerusalem, and therefore in place in Matt. xxiv., does not fit naturally into a prediction which refers exclusively to the second coming of Christ (De Wette). The answer lies in the context. The Lord, at His coming, will *take to himself* (so the word rendered "taken" in verses 34, 35, 36, should have been translated) those who are ready to meet Him (compare John xiv. 3, where the same verb is used, and 1 Thess. iv. 17). But they must be detached from worldly ties, and ready to abandon all earthly blessings at a moment's notice. They are warned by the example of Lot's wife, not to look back, but are bidden to place themselves unreservedly in their Preserver's hands like Lot himself. Solemn words, also spoken elsewhere (ch. ix. 24), are added to impress upon the disciples the necessity of self-abandonment.

32. Bishop Andrew has a noble sermon on this text.

33. *preserve it.*] Or, "make it alive."

34. *in that night.*] Night, with especial reference to the image which immediately follows; but also because night is the season of peace and security, and the Son of Man so cometh "as a thief in the night." The first image is peculiar to St. Luke; with the rest compare, and see notes on, Matt. xxiv. 40, 41.

36. *Two men.*] The verse is wanting in all the best MSS and Versions. It is evidently derived from the parallel passage of Matthew.

37. *And they answered.*] *I.e.* the disciples, to whom the latter part (verses 22-36) of the discourse is addressed. Our Lord had already warned them against listening to the cry, "Lo here!" and "Lo there!" assuring them that the manifestation of the Son of Man would be made instantaneously to the whole world (verses 23, 24). This they were unable to take in, and therefore asked "where" this manifestation should take place. Jesus answers by a second similitude (which in Matt. xxiv. 27, 28, is closely connected with the former one) denoting, like the first, the universality of the Lord's appearance and of God's judgment. On the meaning of the image made use of, see note on Matt. xxiv. 28.

CHAP. XVIII.—1-14. TWO PARABLES ON PRAYER.

1. *And he spake.*] Or, according to most MSS, "And he spake also." The formula closely connects this parable with what goes before. The two parables which follow (verses 1-14), and which are found only in St. Luke, are connected together, partly by the similarity of the formulas by which they are severally introduced (verses 1, 9) and partly by their subjects. The first teaches earnestness in prayer: the second teaches humility in prayer. However, the first parable is also closely connected with the foregoing discourse, as involving an exhortation to the church to be patient during the absence of her Lord, and ending with an anticipation of the state of things which He should find on His return (verses 7, 8).

*men.*] Probably "they," the disciples (see

2 Saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man:

3 And there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary.

4 And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man;

5 Yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me.

6 And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith.

7 And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them?

8 I tell you that he will avenge

---

xvii. 22) regarded as representatives of the Church in all ages.

2. *There was in a city.*] The parable shares with that of the Unjust Steward a paradoxical character. In each an action in itself immoral is made the vehicle of moral and spiritual teaching (see notes on ch. xvi. 1). In this, indeed, the paradox is, at first sight, more glaring, inasmuch as the unjust judge appears to stand as the representative of God Himself. But see note on verse 7. However, the single point of comparison is the efficacy of instant prayer. In this respect it is parallel to the Parable of the Friend coming at Midnight (compare and see note on ch. xi. 5). Still it differs from that parable in having special relation to the needs of a waiting and suffering church. The friend asks for a gift, and the parable encourages us to pray for "good gifts" (ch. xi. 9-13). The widow asks to be avenged of her adversary, and this parable encourages us to believe that God will at length answer the prayers of a persecuted church. "The condition of the church since her Lord's departure resembles that of a widow—a widow deprived of her rights" (Godet). Its teaching is illustrated by the Apocalyptic scene of the souls beneath the altar (Rev. vi. 9-11).

3. *came.*] Repeatedly, as the tense of the original verb implies.

*adversary.*] In a forensic sense: the opposite party in a suit.

4. *Though I fear.*] The soliloquy is dramatic, and gives life and beauty to the parable. The words of the judge echo the description given of him in verse 2, in a way which almost reminds us of ballad poetry.

5. *by her continual coming she weary me.*] The word rendered "weary," according to one reading, literally means "to give a black eye." Meyer understands it literally here, and supposes the judge to fear a personal assault. In that case we should have to translate "lest at length she come and bruise my face." The reading, however, of MSS varies here, as in 1 Cor. ix. 27. One form (ὑπωπιάζω) may, the other (ὑποπιάζω or -έζω) certainly does, bear the meaning represented in the text, which is supported by the order of the words in the original, and seems far preferable.

6. *Hear what.*] As if he had said, "even the teaching of this unrighteous man may convey a lesson."

*unjust judge.*] Literally "judge of unrighteousness." Compare and see note on ch. xvi. 8, 9.

7. *And shall not God.*] The word "God" is, in the original, emphatic by its position. This gives the question in the text the character of an *a fortiori* argument from the foregoing parable (compare ch. xi. 13), and altogether relieves us from the necessity of regarding the unjust judge as the representative of God.

*his own elect.*] Those whom He has chosen out of mankind. Compare Matt. xxiv. 22, 24.

*though he bear long.*] Or probably, according to the best supported reading, "**and is He not longsuffering in respect of them?**" The difficulty lies in the last words of the clause. The question is whether the long-suffering of God, of which the text speaks, is exercised in reference to the elect themselves, or to the sinful world, from whose tyranny they pray to be delivered. It must be observed, first, that the word rendered "bear long," or "long-suffering," as applied to God, has always relation to human sin (Bleek). It cannot therefore be explained away so as to mean merely "delay"; it involves the notion of enduring the contradiction of sinners. There is a close parallel in Ecclus. xxxv. 17, 18, which throws light upon this passage, and in which the same words are used. "The prayer of the humble pierceth the clouds; and till it come nigh he will not be comforted; and will not depart till the Most High shall behold to judge righteously and to execute judgment. For the Lord will not be slack, neither will the mighty be patient towards

them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?

9 And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves [a]that they were righteous, and despised others:

[a] Or, *as being righteous.*

10 Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican.

11 The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men *are*, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican.

12 I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.

13 And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as *his* eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.

14 I tell you, this man went down to his house justified *rather* than the other: [b]for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

[b] Matt. 23. 12.

15 And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them: but when *his* disciples saw *it*, they rebuked them.

16 But Jesus called them *unto him*, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.

17 Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein.

18 [c]And a certain ruler asked

[c] Matt. 19. 16.

---

them" (or "in respect of them"). Olshausen considers that the elect are also represented as the objects of God's long suffering, the reason of His forbearance and delay in punishing the guilty world, being His desire to allow His elect time for discipline and purification. Compare 2 Pet. iii. 9.

**8.** *speedily.*] The apparent contradiction is solved by 2 Pet. iii. 8.

*faith.*] That special form of faith, which is commended in the parable, *i.e.* patience and confidence, the faith which is the great subject of Heb. x. 35-xii. 13.

**9.** *And he spake.*] See note on verse 1. The parable is spoken not so much concerning the Pharisees, but rather to and concerning some of the disciples in whom this Pharisaic tendency had manifested itself.

*others.*] Rather, "**the rest:**" all but themselves.

**11.** *stood.*] The attitude of prayer.

*other men.*] "**The rest of men,**" as above.

**12.** *fast twice.*] Private and voluntary fasts, but observed at stated times; see note on Mark ii. 18.

*possess.*] Rather, "**get**" or acquire. He gives the tenth of his income, not of his property.

**14.** *justified.*] Pardoned, accepted, regarded and treated by God as righteous. The Pharisee had, in his form of words, professed humility in attributing his own supposed excellence to God's grace; but it was pride in the guise of humility, since he reckons up his positive and negative virtues and good deeds with considerable relish. The Publican is all self-abandonment. Our Lord frequently closes His parables with a general maxim. This occurs also Matt. xxiii. 12; ch. xiv. 11. Here it comes with peculiar fitness, at the close of the long series of events, and specially of didactic discourses recorded exclusively by St. Luke.

15–17. CHILDREN BROUGHT TO OUR LORD.

**15.** *And they brought.*] As we approach the termination of the journeyings towards Jerusalem (see note on ch. ix. 51) the narrative of St. Luke begins again to run parallel with the other Synoptists. The remainder of this chapter occurs with certain variations (the most important of which will be noted as they occur) in Matt. xix. 13-xx. 34; Mark x. 13-45; where see notes.

*also infants.*] Or "**even their infants.**" Matthew and Mark say "little children."

**16.** *called them.*] *I.e.* the babes. Peculiar to Luke.

**17.** *Verily.*] This is not found in Matthew, who adds that "He laid his hands upon them;" the fullest account, as usual, is given by St. Mark.

18–30. THE YOUNG RULER.

**18.** *ruler.*] This fact is peculiar to Luke. Compare and see notes on Matt. xix. 16-30; Mark x. 17-31. We learn from those Evangelists that this incident occurred when Jesus was on his way from the place where He blessed the little children.

him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?

19 And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none *is* good, save one, *that is*, God.

20 Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother.

21 And he said, All these have I kept from my youth up.

22 Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.

23 And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich.

24 And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!

25 For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.

26 And they that heard *it* said, Who then can be saved?

27 And he said, The things which are impossible with men are possible with God.

28 [d] Then Peter said, Lo, we have left all, and followed thee.

29 And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake,

30 Who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.

31 ¶ [e] Then he took *unto him* the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished.

32 For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on:

33 And they shall scourge *him*, and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again.

34 And they understood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.

35 ¶ [f] And it came to pass, that

d Matt. 19. 27.
e Matt. 20. 17.
f Matt. 20. 29.

---

21. *from my youth up.*] St. Matthew alone adds "What lack I yet:" the others imply it.

22. *follow me.*] St. Mark, according to the received text, adds "Take up thy cross;" but see note there.

29. *Verily I say.*] The answer is more fully given in Matt. xix. 28, 29. In Matthew and Mark our Lord adds "But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." This saying is immediately followed in Matthew by the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, peculiar to that Gospel. After that the Synoptists again coincide.

### 31–43. Journey to Jericho.

31. *Then he took.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. xx. 17-19; Mark x. 32-34.

*and all things.*] "**And all the things which are written by the prophets shall be accomplished upon the Son of Man.**" The clause is peculiar to St. Luke.

32. *unto the Gentiles.*] St. Luke, the Evangelist of the uncircumcision, omits the prediction of the part played by the Chief Priests and Scribes, given by SS. Matthew and Mark.

34. *And they understood.*] The verse is peculiar to St. Luke. This was the third announcement of the Passion, more clear and precise than either of the others. But the prediction ran counter to the fixed ideas of the disciples concerning the nature of the Messiah's kingdom; and so they failed to understand it. This appears most clearly from the request of the Sons of Zebedee, of which the account is inserted by the other Synoptists at this point. St. Luke omits the incident itself, but relates the state of mind in the disciples out of which it arose. Compare and see note on Mark x. 35.

35. *And it came.*] The difficult question of the identity of the miracles recorded in these passages is thoroughly discussed in the note on St. Matthew's account.

as he was come nigh unto Jericho, a certain blind man sat by the way side begging:

36 And hearing the multitude pass by, he asked what it meant.

37 And they told him, that Jesus of Nazareth passeth by.

38 And he cried, saying, Jesus, *thou* son of David, have mercy on me.

39 And they which went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried so much the more, *Thou* son of David, have mercy on me.

40 And Jesus stood, and commanded him to be brought unto him: and when he was come near, he asked him,

41 Saying, What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee? And he said, Lord, that I may receive my sight.

42 And Jesus said unto him, Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee.

43 And immediately he received his sight, and followed him, glorifying God: and all the people, when they saw *it*, gave praise unto God.

## CHAPTER XIX.

*1 Of Zacchæus a publican. 11 The ten pieces of money. 28 Christ rideth into Jerusalem with triumph: 41 weepeth over it: 45 driveth the buyers and sellers out of the temple: 47 teaching daily in it. The rulers would have destroyed him, but for fear of the people.*

AND *Jesus* entered and passed through Jericho.

2 And, behold, *there was* a man named Zacchæus, which was the chief among the publicans, and he was rich.

3 And he sought to see Jesus, who he was; and could not for the press, because he was little of stature.

4 And he ran before, and climbed up into a sycomore tree to see him: for he was to pass that *way*.

5 And when Jesus came to the place, he looked up, and saw him, and said unto him, Zacchæus, make haste, and come down; for to day I must abide at thy house.

6 And he made haste, and came down, and received him joyfully.

7 And when they saw *it*, they all murmured, saying, That he was gone to be guest with a man that is a sinner.

---

CHAP. XIX.—1–10. THE CONVERSION OF ZACCHÆUS.

1. *And Jesus, &c.*] Or, "**And having entered into Jericho he was passing through it.**" The narrative of Zacchæus (verses 1-10), and the Parable of the Minæ which immediately follows it (verses 11-27), are peculiar to St. Luke.

2. *Zacchæus.*] *I.e.* "Zaccai," Remembrancer. Compare Ezr. ii. 9; Neh. vii. 14.

*chief among the publicans.*] The compound word thus translated occurs here only. It probably means the agent of the Roman publicanus, properly so called, entrusted with the oversight of the tax-collectors. The chief source of revenue at Jericho would arise from balsam, which was extensively cultivated there.

*he.*] "**This man.**"

3. *the press.*] "**The crowd.**"

4. *sycomore.*] This tree, as was stated in the note on ch. xvii. 6, differs from the sycamine: it grows only in those parts of Palestine where the climate is warmest, as in "the low plains" (see 1 Chron. xxvii. 28), *i.e.* in the low-lying Jordan Valley. "It is very easy to climb, with its short trunk, and its wide lateral branches forking out in all directions."—Tristram, 'N. H. B.,' p. 398. St. Luke, who is generally indifferent to geographical details, thus preserves the local colouring.

5. *I must.*] This was His destined place of rest, which God had selected for Him (Meyer, Godet). Compare ch. iv. 43; xiii. 33.

6. *he made haste.*] The words are a precise echo of our Lord's command (verse 5); and the resemblance is even more striking in the original. They mark the promptness with which Zacchæus complied.

7. *That he was gone.*] Compare ch. v. 30; xv. 1.

8 And Zacchæus stood, and said unto the Lord; Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore *him* fourfold.

9 And Jesus said unto him, This day is salvation come to this house, forsomuch as he also is a son of Abraham.

10 [a]For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.

[a] Matt. 18. 11.

11 And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because

---

8. *stood.*] The attitude denotes a free and fearless character, and willingness to do any act which a conscience convinced of sin by our Lord's personal influence would suggest as right and just.

*I give.*] *I.e.* I now propose to give; such is the force of the verb in the original. It refers not to previous habits, but to present intention.

*if I have taken.*] Literally, "if I falsely informed anything of any man;" but our Version gives the true meaning. The temptation to do this was incidental to the calling. The expression, "if I have taken anything" (*i.e.* "whatsoever I have taken," for the phrase does not express any doubt) "from any man by false accusation," is incompatible with the view that Zacchæus is defending himself against a false charge.

*fourfold.*] The Law required at least fourfold restitution in the case of theft, see Exod. xxii. 1: Zacchæus thus recognises the greatness of his former guilt, and voluntarily offers the penalty inflicted by the divine law.

9. *unto him.*] Not "in relation to him," but "to him" (Meyer, Godet), *i.e.* addressing him, though speaking of him in the third person.

*is salvation come.*] "**Salvation was**, or **came**;" meaning by "salvation" both Himself, and the conversion of Zacchæus, which His words had wrought.

*is a son of Abraham.*] Many ancient and some modern commentators understand this to mean that Zacchæus, whether or not a heathen by birth, now became a "son of Abraham" in a spiritual sense, by his conversion: but it probably signifies that he was a son of Abraham literally (compare ch. xiii. 16), and had claims and rights by reason of his covenant relation to God, as well as other Jews ("he also"), although a publican. Nevertheless, he was one of "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," whom the Son of Man is sent "to seek and to save" (compare Matt. xviii. 11).

11–27. PARABLE OF THE TEN POUNDS.

11. *as they heard.*] The parable which follows (verses 11-27), and which is only found in Luke, was consequently spoken at the same time and place as the foregoing address to Zacchæus, to which it is expressly said to have been an addition. In its general outline it closely resembles the Parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv. 14-30), so much so, that it is regarded by Calvin, Meyer, Olshausen (who, however, looks upon it as the original form), and others, as merely a different version of the same parable. Others with far greater probability regard the parables as distinct. If these two parables are to be regarded as one, "we must at once give up, not only the pretensions to historical accuracy on the part of our Gospels (see verse 11), but all idea that they furnish us with the words of our Lord anywhere; for *the whole structure and incidents of the two are essentially different*" (Alford). It is not difficult to conceive that our Lord repeated the parable (as He certainly did other sayings) with variations adapted to the occasion. The main differences between the two parables may be stated thus: (1) that of the Talents tells us the simple story of the committal of certain sums of money to individuals, and of the use made by each of the sum entrusted to him,—that of the Pounds is complicated with a distinct incident, viz., the opposition of the citizens, and the vengeance taken upon them; (2) in that of the Talents the principal person is a householder, in that of the Pounds he is a nobleman seeking a kingdom; (3) the Talents are given in various proportions,—the Pounds are distributed equally; (4) there is an enormous difference between the sums entrusted in each case (see on verse 13); (5) in the Parable of the Pounds the slothful servant only suffers loss,—in that of the Talents a positive punishment is inflicted besides. To these distinctions we are to add that the parable in the text is said to have been delivered at Jericho, and that of the Talents at Jerusalem; while the special matter which the former alone contains is precisely suitable to the motive for delivering it, ascribed by the Evangelist to our Lord (compare verses 11, 12, 14, 27). With the whole parable compare and see notes on Matt. xxv. 14-30.

*because he was.*] Rather, "**because he**

they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear.

12 [b]He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.

[b] Matt. 25. 14.

13 And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten [1]pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come.

[1] *Mina*, here translated a pound, is twelve ounces and an half: which according to five shillings the ounce is three pounds two shillings and sixpence.

14 But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this *man* to reign over us.

15 And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading.

16 Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds.

17 And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities.

18 And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds.

19 And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities.

20 And another came, saying, Lord, behold, *here is* thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin:

---

**was nigh to Jerusalem, and they thought,"** &c. The reasons are not two, but one. Our Lord was now at Jericho, about fifteen miles from Jerusalem, and His followers generally connected His arrival there with the open manifestation of God's kingdom. The word 'they' must refer to the bystanders, who had been murmuring, verse 7. Compare and see note on ch. xvii. 20.

*appear.*] Or, "**be displayed.**" The word hints at the grand spectacle to which they looked forward.

**12.** *A certain nobleman.*] The story reflects the political circumstances of the age. It represents a person of high position travelling to Rome to receive a vassal kingdom, like that of the Herods. There may be a special allusion to Archelaus, as a message, like that described in verse 14, was actually sent in his case (Josephus, 'Ant.' xvii. 11, 1.) He had built a splendid palace at Jericho (*ib.* xx. 13, 1), so that there was a peculiar appropriateness in the historical allusion.

*into a far country.*] From which he could not immediately return. In answer to the "immediately" of verse 11 (Meyer).

**13.** *servants.*] Lit. "**ten servants of his own,**" *i.e.*, as usual in the N. T., "slaves." The expression implies that they belonged to his own household, and might therefore be expected to be diligent and earnest. It points also to the special relations of Christians to their Redeemer.

*pounds.*] Or Minæ. The Attic Mina was a little more than £3 of our money. In the Parable of the Talents, the master gives all his money (Matt. xxv. 14) to be traded with; here, he merely leaves with each servant a small sum as a test of his ability and fidelity, with a view to his employment in a greater charge hereafter (verses 17, 19). The servants signify the professing followers of Christ, of whom each will be called to give an account of the use made by him of God's gifts.

*Occupy.*] *I.e.* trade with this money; the word is specially used of commercial transactions.

*till I come.*] Or, according to the best supported reading, "**while I am coming,**" *i.e.* while I am on my journey. Our Lord lays special stress on the coming back, when an account must be rendered. Compare the warning in Matt. xxiv. 48.

**14.** *his citizens.*] Or, "**his fellow-citizens,**" representing the Jews, as being the countrymen of Christ.

*this man.*] Contemptuously expressed (Bengel): almost equivalent to "this fellow."

**15.** *how much every, &c.*] Rather "**what**" business "**each had undertaken.**"

**16.** *thy pound.*] Grotius says (comparing 1 Cor. xv. 10), "He modestly attributes this to his lord's money, and not to his own work."

*hath gained.*] "**Earned in addition.**"

**17.** *a very little.*] So it was, compared both with the sums entrusted in St. Matthew's parable, and with the reward. Compare ch. xvi. 10.

**18.** *hath gained.*] Or "**made.**"

**20.** *Lord, behold, &c.*] "**Lord, behold thy pound, which I was keeping laid by in a napkin.**"

21 For I feared thee, because thou art an austere man: thou takest up that thou layedst not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow.

22 And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, *thou* wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow:

23 Wherefore then gavest not thou my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury?

24 And he said unto them that stood by, Take from him the pound, and give *it* to him that hath ten pounds.

25 (And they said unto him, Lord, he hath ten pounds.)

26 For I say unto you, [c]That unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him.

[c] Matt. 13. 12.

27 But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay *them* before me.

28 ¶ And when he had thus spoken, he went before, ascending up to Jerusalem.

29 [d]And it came to pass, when he was come nigh to Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount called *the mount* of Olives, he sent two of his disciples,

[d] Matt. 21. 1.

30 Saying, Go ye into the village over against *you;* in the which at your entering ye shall find a colt tied, whereon yet never man sat: loose him, and bring *him hither.*

31 And if any man ask you, Why do ye loose *him?* thus shall ye say unto him, Because the Lord hath need of him.

32 And they that were sent went their way, and found even as he had said unto them.

33 And as they were loosing the colt, the owners thereof said unto them, Why loose ye the colt?

34 And they said, The Lord hath need of him.

35 And they brought him to Jesus: and they cast their garments upon the colt, and they set Jesus thereon.

36 And as he went, they spread their clothes in the way.

---

**21.** *takest up.*] So it is doubtless to be translated: the expression is proverbial in form, like the second member of the sentence (so Meyer, De Wette, and Bleek who gives instances of the proverbial use both in Hebrew and Greek, and would translate "takest *away,*" *i. e.* "thou askest back more than thou gavest in charge").

**25.** *they said.*] The bystanders. The lord proceeds without noticing the interruption. The saying which follows is one repeatedly used by our Lord: compare Matt. xiii. 12; xxv. 29; Mark iv. 25; ch. viii. 18.

**27.** *But.*] Or "only."

*those.*] The same pronoun, in the original, which is contemptuously applied to the nobleman by these same enemies: verse 14 (Oosterzee). The figurative coming of Christ to take vengeance upon the Jews who rejected Him, and His literal coming at the end of the world, are here combined into one picture, as in Matt. xxiv.

**28.** *before.*] *I.e.* at the head of His disciples: compare Mark x. 32. It is evident from this that the Parable of the Pounds was delivered immediately before our Lord's departure from Jericho. This verse marks the close of the narrative of our Lord's journeyings towards Jerusalem, which began at ch. ix. 51, where see note. From this point the Synoptical Gospels coincide in the main, but, as usual when this is the case, St. Luke is far more sparing in details.

29–48. THE ENTRANCE INTO JERUSALEM.

**29.** *And it came to pass.*] The narrative of the Passion and its attendant circumstances, opens with this verse. With St. Luke's account of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem (verses 29–40) compare, and see notes on Matt. xxi. 1–11, Mark xi. 1–11. See also John xii. 12–19.

**30.** *a colt tied.*] "An ass tied, and a colt with her," Matt. xxi. 2.

*whereon yet never.*] See note on Mark xi. 2.

**36.** *spread their clothes.*] Matthew (xxi. 8) and Mark (xi. 8) also mention branches of trees, or palm-branches.

37 And when he was come nigh, even now at the descent of the mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen;

38 Saying, Blessed *be* the King that cometh in the name of the Lord: peace in heaven, and glory in the highest.

39 And some of the Pharisees from among the multitude said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples.

40 And he answered and said unto them, I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.

41 ¶ And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it,

42 Saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things *which belong* unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes.

43 For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side.

44 And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; be-

---

**37.** *And when he was.*] St. Luke alone states the exact place at which this manifestation of popular feeling began. "Bethany is hardly left in the rear before the long procession must have swept up and over the ridge, where first begins 'the descent of the Mount of Olives' towards Jerusalem. At this point the first view is caught of the south-eastern corner of the city. The Temple and the more northern portions are hid by the slope of Olivet on the right. . . . . It was at this precise point, 'as He drew near, at the descent of the Mount of Olives,'—may it not have been from the sight thus opening upon them?—that the hymn of triumph . . . burst forth from the multitude." Stanley, 'Sinai and Palestine.' St. John (xii. 18) connects this outburst of popular feeling with the resurrection of Lazarus; this coincides substantially with St. Luke's account, who specially connects the exclamation with the miracles, which he elsewhere notices as frequent, though he records but few: see note on ch. xiii. 32.

**38.** *peace in heaven, &c.*] In St. Luke only. "There is peace in heaven" between God and man: therefore let "glory" be ascribed to God "in the highest" (De Wette, Meyer, Godet). Compare ch. ii. 14. SS. Matthew and Mark make the multitude cry "Hosanna." Luke omits the word, probably because his Gentile readers would not have understood it.

**39.** *And some of.*] This incident and our Lord's reply are peculiar to Luke. The answer is proverbial, both in Hebrew and classical writers; it recals Hab. ii. 11.

**40.** *if these.*] "**If these hold their peace, the stones shall cry out.**"

**41.** *And when.*] Our Lord's lamentation over Jerusalem on this occasion (verses 41-44) is found in St. Luke only. SS. Matthew and Mark tell us that the procession advanced at once to the Temple itself; and inform us what then took place (Matt. xxi. 10–16; Mark xi. 11, 15). Compare ch. xxiii. 28–32. "Again the procession advanced. The road descends a slight declivity, and the glimpse of the city is again withdrawn behind the intervening ridge of Olivet. A few moments, and the path mounts again; it climbs a rugged ascent, it reaches a ledge of smooth rock, and in an instant the whole city bursts into view. . . . . Immediately below was the valley of the Kedron, here seen in its greatest depth as it joins the Valley of Hinnom, and thus giving full effect to the great peculiarity of Jerusalem seen only on its eastern side—its situation as of a city rising out of a deep abyss. It is hardly possible to doubt that this rise and turn of the road, this rocky ledge, was the exact point where the multitude paused again, and 'He, when He beheld the city, wept over it.'" Stanley, 'Sinai and Palestine,' ch. iii.

**42.** *even thou.*] Or "**thou too,**" *i.e.* as well as the disciples and the mixed multitude, who cried Hosanna. The objection of the Pharisees (verse 39) had brought before Him the blindness of the people of Jerusalem.

*but now.*] *I. e.* but, *in fact*, they are hid, or "**were hid,**" &c.

**43.** *For the days.*] So, no doubt it should be translated. Some connect it with the foregoing sentence, and render "But now it was hidden from thine eyes, that the days shall come," &c.

*trench.*] Strictly a "stockade," such as was

cause thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.

[e Matt. 21. 12.] 45 [e] And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought;

46 Saying unto them, It is written, My house is the house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of thieves.

47 And he taught daily in the temple. But the chief priests and the scribes and the chief of the people sought to destroy him,

48 And could not find what they might do: for all the people [1]were very attentive to hear him.

[1 Or, *hanged on him.*]

## CHAPTER XX.

1 *Christ avoucheth his authority by a question of John's baptism.* 9 *The parable of the vineyard.* 19 *Of giving tribute to Cæsar.* 27 *He convinceth the Sadducees that denied the resurrection.* 41 *How Christ is the son of David.* 45 *He warneth his disciples to beware of the scribes.*

[f Matt. 21. 23.] AND [f] it came to pass, *that* on one of those days, as he taught the people in the temple, and preached the gospel, the chief priests and the scribes came upon *him* with the elders,

2 And spake unto him, saying, Tell us, by what authority doest thou these things? or who is he that gave thee this authority?

3 And he answered and said unto them, I will also ask you one thing; and answer me:

4 The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?

5 And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say, Why then believed ye him not?

6 But and if we say, Of men; all the people will stone us: for they be persuaded that John was a prophet.

7 And they answered, that they could not tell whence *it was*.

8 And Jesus said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

9 Then began he to speak to the people this parable; [g] A certain man [g Mk. 12. 1.]

---

actually raised by Titus (Josephus, 'B. J.' v. vi. 2). Compare Isaiah xxix. 3; ch. xxi. 20.

**44.** *time.*] *I.e.* "moment," or "proper time."

*visitation.*] "Wherein God hath looked upon thee to save thee;" compare ch. i. 68. The word is generally used in the sense of a judicial visitation, but here no doubt is a season of grace; so in such passages as Gen. l. 24; Ex. iv. 31, &c.

**45.** *into the temple.*] The second purification of the Temple (verses 45, 46) is related more fully in Matthew (xxi. 12, 13) and Mark (xi. 15-17): see the notes on those passages. Compare also John ii. 13–17. St. Luke omits the retirement to Bethany, and the Barren Fig-tree mentioned by SS. Matthew (xxi. 18–22) and Mark (xi. 12–14). His narrative is condensed, as usual when he coincides with the other Synoptists.

**47.** *taught daily.*] This daily teaching is mentioned by St. Luke alone.

*the chief priests, &c.*] See note on Mark xi. 18.

**48.** *were very attentive.*] Better, according to the marginal rendering "**hanged on him**" (hung on his words). The idiom is common in classical writers, cf. Virgil, Æn. iv. 79; Horace, Ep. i. 105, and numerous passages from late Greek authors quoted by Wetstein. St. Mark says (xi. 18) "For they feared him, because all the people was astonished at his doctrine."

CHAP. XX.—1–9. INQUIRY INTO AUTHORITY.

**1.** *one of those days.*] In which He "taught daily in the Temple" (ch. xix. 47).

*came upon him.*] "**Came suddenly upon**" him. Matthew says "came;" Mark, "come."

**3.** *answer me.*] "And I will tell you by what authority I do these things" (Matt. and Mark).

**6.** *all the people will stone us.*] "We fear" (Matt.), or "they feared" (Mark) "the people." To this conversation St. Matthew appends the Parable of the Two Sons (xxi. 28–32).

9–18. PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.

**9.** *Then began he.*] The expression "began" (see note on Mark xii. 1) has reference to a series of parables, of which, however, neither St. Mark nor St. Luke give more than one. The parable before us, with the discourse arising out of it, is found also in Matt. xxi. 33–46;

planted a vineyard, and let it forth to husbandmen, and went into a far country for a long time.

10 And at the season he sent a servant to the husbandmen, that they should give him of the fruit of the vineyard: but the husbandmen beat him, and sent *him* away empty.

11 And again he sent another servant: and they beat him also, and entreated *him* shamefully, and sent *him* away empty.

12 And again he sent a third: and they wounded him also, and cast *him* out.

13 Then said the lord of the vineyard, What shall I do? I will send my beloved son: it may be they will reverence *him* when they see him.

14 But when the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned among themselves, saying, This is the heir: come, let us kill him, that the inheritance may be our's.

15 So they cast him out of the vineyard, and killed *him*. What therefore shall the lord of the vineyard do unto them?

16 He shall come and destroy these husbandmen, and shall give the vineyard to others. And when they heard *it*, they said, God forbid.

17 And he beheld them, and said, What is this then that is written, [b]The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner?

[b] Ps. 118. 22.

18 Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

19 ¶ And the chief priests and the scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him; and they feared the people: for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against them.

20 And they watched *him*, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they

---

Mark xii. 1–12; where see notes. St. Luke alone tells us that it was addressed "to the people."

11. *And again he sent.*] More exactly, "he sent in addition."

13. *Then said the lord.*] St. Mark alone says (xii. 6) "Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved." See note on that passage.

16. *And when they, &c.*] Peculiar to St. Luke.

17. *beheld them.*] *I. e.* looked gravely upon them: only in Luke.

*What is this then.*] *I. e.* "If this is not to be, according to your prayer (verse 16), what is the meaning of this scripture?" Ps. cxviii. 22. SS. Matthew and Mark complete the citation; and St. Matthew adds (xxi. 43) "Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

18. *Whosoever shall.*] So Matt. xxi. 44, where most critics look upon the words as an interpolation, but see the note on that passage. There is no doubt as to their genuineness and suitableness here. St. Mark omits them.

19–26. THE QUESTION OF TRIBUTE-MONEY.

19. *the same hour.*] This point is noticed by St. Luke alone. The designs of the Chief Priests, &c. are given also in Matt. (xxi. 45, 46) and Mark (xii. 12). Immediately after this St. Matthew alone inserts another parable bearing on the same subject, viz., that of the Wedding of the King's Son.

*and they feared.*] *I. e.* they gave up the attempt because they feared the people. The words, "for they knew" refer to their intention. An interval between this and the following attempt is indicated by St. Mark xii. 12.

20. *And they watched.*] We now come to two captious questions put to our Lord (1) by the Pharisees and Herodians concerning tribute (verses 20–26; compare and see notes on Matt. xxii. 15–22; Mark xii. 13–17); (2) by the Sadducees concerning the Resurrection (verses 27-40; compare and see notes on Matt. xxii. 23-33; Mark xii. 18-27).

*spies.*] Properly, men "suborned;" St. Luke as usual has a classical expression.

*that so they might, &c.*] Peculiar to St. Luke.

might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor.

21 And they asked him, saying, [c]Master, we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly, neither acceptest thou the person *of any*, but teachest the way of God [1]truly:

[c] Matt. 22. 16.

[1] Or, *of a truth*.

22 Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar, or no?

23 But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, Why tempt ye me?

24 Shew me a [1]penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? They answered and said, Cæsar's.

[1] See Matt. 18. 28.

25 And he said unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's, and unto God the things which be God's.

26 And they could not take hold of his words before the people: and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace.

27 ¶ [d]Then came to *him* certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection; and they asked him,

[d] Matt. 22. 23.

28 Saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.

29 There were therefore seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died without children.

30 And the second took her to wife, and he died childless.

31 And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died.

32 Last of all the woman died also.

33 Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife.

34 And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage:

35 But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage:

36 Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

37 Now that the dead are raised, [e]even Moses shewed at the bush,

[e] Ex.

---

*unto the power and authority.*] Rather "**to the** *secular* **power**," and "**to the authority of the governor.**" The second clause explains the former one. It is an important notice, shewing that they already contemplated the act, which filled up the measure of their guilt: see note on Matt. xxvii. 1, 2.

**24.** *penny.*] Or "**denarius.**" So Mark xii. 15 (Matt. xxii. 19 gives "the tribute-money"). For the value of the denarius see note on Matt. xx. 2.

**26.** *And they could, &c.*] St. Matthew (xxii. 22) says "When they had heard these words they marvelled, and left him and went their way;" St. Mark (xii. 17) simply, "And they marvelled at him."

27–38. THE QUESTION OF THE RESURRECTION.

**27.** *Then came.*] St. Matthew (xxii. 23) adds "The same day."

**30.** *And the second, &c.*] Perhaps we ought to read "And the second, and the third took her; and likewise also the seven left no children and died." But the MSS vary.

**33.** *is she?*] Or, "doth she become?"

*for seven.*] Rather, "**for the seven.**"

**34.** *The children of this world.*] Compare and see note on ch. xvi. 8. St. Luke omits the remarkable words recited in Matt. (xxii. 29) and Mark (xii. 24), "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God."

*marry, and, &c.*] Compare ch. xvii. 27.

**36.** *Neither can.*] Rather, "**for neither can.**"

*equal unto the angels.*] A distinct assertion of the doctrine of angels against the Sadducees, who denied it. (Acts xxiii. 8.)

*being the children.*] They are children of God in a special sense, since God has given them life by an act of His power. This expression is specially used in Matthew and Luke with reference to the future state.

**37.** *even Moses.*] In whom they trusted.

*at the bush.*] So in Mark xii. 26. The words

when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.

38 For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him.

39 ¶ Then certain of the scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said.

40 And after that they durst not ask him any *question at all.*

41 And he said unto them, [f] How say they that Christ is David's son?

42 And David himself saith in the book of Psalms, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand,

43 Till I make thine enemies thy footstool.

44 David therefore calleth him Lord, how is he then his son?

45 ¶ Then in the audience of all the people he said unto his disciples,

46 [g] Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love greetings in the markets, and the highest seats in the synagogues, and the chief rooms at feasts;

47 Which devour widows' houses, and for a shew make long prayers: the same shall receive greater damnation.

[f] Matt. 22. 41. [g] Matt. 23. 5.

## CHAPTER XXI.

1 *Christ commendeth the poor widow.* 5 *He foretelleth the destruction of the temple, and of the city Jerusalem:* 25 *the signs also which shall be before the last day.* 34 *He exhorteth them to be watchful.*

AND he looked up, [h] and saw the rich men casting their gifts into the treasury.

[h] Mark 12. 41.

---

might be understood locally, as they are used by Mark, but hardly so in this place. They mean "in the passage concerning the bush." (Exod. iii. 6.)

**38.** *of the dead, &c.*] Or, "**of dead, but of living men.**"

*for all live unto him.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. The particle "for" connects this addition closely with "living" in the preceding clause. "All, even those who have passed away from the eyes of men, still live in the sight of God." This saying is taken up and expanded by St. Paul, Rom. xiv. 8, who gives it a practical application to the present life and duties of Christians; see also Acts xvii. 28, where its bearings upon man as such are drawn out.

39–47. QUESTION WITH THE SCRIBES.

**39.** *Then certain, &c.*] See the notes on the much fuller account given by St. Mark xii. 28–34. The Scribes were surprised to hear from our Lord so powerful an argument in defence of their cherished dogma, and judged it prudent to lay no more snares for Him.

**41.** *unto them.*] To the Scribes: St. Matthew says "to the Pharisees:" the accounts are independent, although quite consistent. SS. Matthew (xxii. 34-40) and Mark (xii. 28-34) interpose at this point a third question put to our Lord, that concerning "the great commandment of the law." (See notes on ch. x. 25.) After this, our Lord turns against His adversaries their own method of attack. The question is found in nearly the same words in Matt. xxii. 41-46; Mark xii. 35-37 (where see notes). St. Matthew alone adds, "And no man was able to answer him a word; neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions."

**45.** *Then in the audience.*] This denunciation of the Scribes (verses 45-47), which is found in nearly the same terms in Mark xii. 38-40, is evidently a condensed report of the long discourse which is found in Matt. xxiii., and which there stands as the prelude to the great prophetic passage in Matt. xxiv., xxv.

*unto his disciples.*] Perhaps we are to read, "**unto them.**" Mark says, "unto them:" Matthew, "to the multitude, and to his disciples."

**46.** *in long robes.*] They affected peculiarities of dress, by way of attracting attention: so in Matt. xxiii. 5: "They make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments."

*love greetings, &c.*] Compare and see note on Matt. xxiii. 6, 7.

**47.** *devour widows' houses.*] Compare 2 Tim. iii. 6.

*for a shew.*] Compare Matt. vi. 5.

CHAP. XXI.—1-4. THE WIDOW'S MITES.

**1.** *And he looked up.*] The incident of the widow's mites is found only here and Mark xii. 41-44 (where see notes). It is evident

2 And he saw also a certain poor widow casting in thither two [l] mites.

[l] See Mark 12. 42.

3 And he said, Of a truth I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast in more than they all:

4 For all these have of their abundance cast in unto the offerings of God: but she of her penury hath cast in all the living that she had.

5 ¶ [t] And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts, he said,

[t] Matt. 24. 1.

6 *As for* these things which ye behold, the days will come, in the which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

7 And they asked him, saying, Master, but when shall these things be? and what sign *will there be* when these things shall come to pass?

8 And he said, Take heed that ye be not deceived: for many shall come in my name, saying, I am *Christ;* and the time draweth near: go ye not therefore after them.

9 But when ye shall hear of wars and commotions, be not terrified: for these things must first come to pass; but the end *is* not by and by.

10 [a] Then said he unto them, Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:

[a] Matt. 24. 7.

11 And great earthquakes shall be

---

from the opening words of St. Luke's account that it occurred immediately after the denunciation of the Scribes.

*the treasury.*] See on Mark. xii. 41.

**2.** *two mites.*] Or, "two lepta." The smallest possible coins: Mark explains, "which make a farthing." We may therefore suppose the mite to be one-eighth part of the Roman as. Bengel says pithily, but not with his usual accuracy, "She might have kept one;" for a less offering was not permitted by law: see Schoettgen, 'Hor. Heb.' tom. i. p. 250.

**3.** *more than they all.*] "In the discourses which Jesus addresses to His disciples, He endeavours to lead their minds to the true estimate of human actions, that is, according to their *quality*, instead of the estimate according to *quantity* which was the root of Pharisaism." (Godet.)

**4.** *penury.*] Or, "deficiency."

1–37. THE GREAT PROPHECY.

**5.** *And as some.*] This conversation (verses 5, 6) took place as our Lord and His disciples were leaving the Temple immediately after the incident last recounted. It occurs in the same place in Matt. xxiv. 1, 2; Mark xiii. 1, 2; where see notes. The remark of the disciples was possibly elicited by our Lord's saying about the widow's mite which they had imperfectly understood. "Had none given more than that poor widow, where would have been the goodly stones and costly offerings?" Vinet has a striking sermon founded on this view: see "Études évangéliques," p. 248 *seq.*

*goodly stones.*] The Temple was built of white marble, but it was the size and careful workmanship which specially attracted the admiration of the disciples; see note on Mark xiii. 1.

**7.** *they asked.*] That is, the disciples, as we are told by St. Matthew. St. Mark tells us more particularly that the question was asked by Peter, James, John and Andrew; and both SS. Matthew and Mark inform us that it was asked "as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, over against the Temple." Compare and see notes on Matt. xxiv. 3; Mark xiii. 3, 4. In Matthew the question of the disciples is more precisely stated than in Mark or Luke: "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of *thy coming*, and of *the end of the world?*" The two events are thus distinguished.

*and what sign, &c.*] Rather, "**And what**" shall be "**the sign, when these things are about to come to pass?**"

**8.** *And he said.*] Our Lord's reply, containing the great prophecy (verses 8-36) is also found in Matt. xxiv. 4-51 (more fully), and in Mark xiii. 5-37; where see notes. St. Matthew's recital contains certain passages found also in the prediction in ch. xvii. 20-37 (see notes on that place), which St. Luke, with his usual care to avoid repetition, omits here.

*I am Christ.*] Or, "**I am**" he. So St. Mark. St. Matthew says, "I am the Christ:" and SS. Matthew and Mark add, "and shall deceive many."

*and the time, &c.*] *I.e.* of the manifestation of the Messianic kingdom: peculiar to St. Luke.

**9.** *by and by.*] Immediately. SS. Matthew and Mark say, "not yet."

in divers places, and famines, and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven.

12 But before all these, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute *you*, delivering *you* up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake.

13 And it shall turn to you for a testimony.

14 [b] Settle *it* therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer:

[b] Matt. 10. 19.

15 For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist.

16 And ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends; and *some* of you shall they cause to be put to death.

17 And ye shall be hated of all *men* for my name's sake.

18 [c] But there shall not an hair of your head perish.

[c] Matt. 10. 30.

19 In your patience possess ye your souls.

20 [d] And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh.

[d] Matt. 24. 15.

---

**11.** *and fearful sights, &c.*] Peculiar to St. Luke, who thus explains the words "These are the beginnings of sorrows," which SS. Matthew and Mark have in this place. See on Matt. xxiv. 8.

**12.** *before all these.*] Some difficulty seems to arise with regard to the order of the events predicted. St. Matthew mentions the public calamities before the persecutions of which all the Synoptical Evangelists speak; but it is not at all clear that he means us to understand that they were to occur in the order in which he gives them. He says simply *then* (Matt. xxiv. 9), which does not mean "after that." The expression used by him is vague; and all that is certain is that the three Evangelists agree in placing both calamities and persecutions before the time of "the end." (Compare Matt. xxiv. 6, and Mark xiii. 7, with verse 9.) In fact St. Luke's expression is rather to be understood as referring to the completion: not before any part, but before all that has been predicted and fulfilled.

*to the synagogues.*] To be scourged: see Mark xiii. 9; and compare Matt. x. 17; ch. xii. 11.

*kings and rulers.*] Emperors and governors. Our Lord proceeds in a natural order from the opposition of Jewish authorities to the opposition of the heathen. So in Mark xiii. 9. St. Matthew says in the same place, "And ye shall be hated of all nations (or 'of all the Gentiles') for my name's sake."

**13.** *And it shall, &c.*] St. Mark (xiii. 9) has "for a testimony against them;" and Matthew, in a similar though not parallel passage (x. 18) "for a testimony against them and the Gentiles." Read in the light of those places, the text must mean, "this will issue for you in an opportunity of bearing witness to the world." St. Mark appends to the parallel words, above quoted, a saying which explains their import, and consequently that of the text: "And the Gospel must first be published among all nations." Compare Matt. xxiv. 14.

**15.** *For I will give.*] Peculiar to St. Luke.

**16.** *And ye shall be betrayed.*] Somewhat differently in Matt. xxiv. 10, and Mark xiii. 12. But see Matt. x. 21.

**17.** *And ye shall be hated.*] So in Mark xiii. 13. Also in the similar passage, Matt. x. 22. Compare too John xv. 21.

**18.** *But there shall.*] Compare Matt. x. 30; ch. xii. 7.

**19.** *In your patience, &c.*] Only in St. Luke. Translate "**In** (or, "**by**) **your patience acquire ye**," (or, according to a well-supported reading, "**ye shall acquire**) **your souls**." That is to say patience and constancy would be the element in which they would be able to save their souls. (Compare Matt. xvi. 25, where the word "find" is similarly used.)

**20.** *And when.*] This is the true sign given in answer to the question in verse 7, in opposition to the false signs, verses 8-19.

*Jerusalem compassed.*] SS. Matthew and Mark here refer to the "abomination of desolation" as the signal for flight. The expression used by St. Luke is an interpretation intended for his Gentile readers, and of paramount importance for the exegesis of the other Evangelists. It accords perhaps better with the view of Mr. Greswell, noticed in the note on Matt. xxiv. 15, than with that which Dean Mansel has adopted; see p. 139.

21 Then let them which are in Judæa flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto.

22 For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.

23 But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people.

24 And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

25 ¶ [c] And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring;

[c] Matt. 24. 29.

26 Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken.

---

21. *Then let them which are in Judæa.*] So Matt. xxiv. 16; Mark xiii. 14; where see notes.

*and let them, &c.*] Only in St. Luke.

*in the midst of it.*] Lit. "of her," viz. Jerusalem, mentioned verse 20.

*countries.*] *I.e.* the rural districts. The inhabitants of the country naturally take refuge in fortified cities in time of war: those of Palestine are here specially warned against doing so, as the chief catastrophe would fall upon the city. SS. Matthew and Mark here add words which are found in nearly the same form, in ch. xvii. 31.

22. *For these be.*] Peculiar to St. Luke.

23. *for there shall.*] The rest of this verse, and the following one, are only found in Luke. They contain a distinct announcement of the catastrophe impending.

24. *the times of the Gentiles.*] *I.e.* "The seasons" or "opportunities of the Gentiles." The expression is variously interpreted, either as referring to the period during which the Gentiles are permitted to occupy Jerusalem and the Holy Land, and to be ministers of God's judgments upon the Jews (Bengel, De Wette, Meyer, Bleek, Oosterzee), or to the day of grace accorded to the Gentiles, the opportunities accorded to them of turning to God (Ebrard, Stier, Godet), in a word, "the Gentile dispensation." (Alford.) The former interpretation accords best with the Greek; the word rendered "trodden down" meaning, in all other passages of the New Testament, trampled and treated ignominiously; cf. Apocal. xi. 2: but in point of fact these two interpretations run up into one. The period during which the Gentiles hold the Holy Land in subjection coincides with, and is an outward symbol of, the period during which they possess the Church of God in place of the Jews. Compare Romans xi. throughout and especially verse 25; "blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." Alford says of this passage that it is "a most important addition . . . . carrying on the prophetic announcements, past our own times, even close to the days of the end." In fact, it serves to separate the strictly eschatological portion of the great prophecy, from the part belonging properly to the destruction of Jerusalem. Matthew (xxiv. 23-28) and Mark xiii. (21-23) here add warnings against false Christs and false prophets who should arise in the time of the great tribulation. The words occur in the discourse in answer to the Pharisees, ch. xvii. 20-24, 37.

25. *And there shall be.*] In St. Luke's account, our Lord passes from the judgment on Jerusalem, to the judgment on the world (verses 25-28). The interval is designated in the last verse as the "times of the Gentiles," which are now regarded as closed. In the parallel passages (Matt. xxiv. 29-31; Mark xiii. 24-27) the events are regarded as more closely connected in point of time. Matthew says "immediately after;" Mark, "in those days:" but see notes, p. 142. The heavenly signs are given more minutely by SS. Matthew and Mark; the terrestrial signs (verses 25, 26) only by St. Luke.

*and upon the earth, &c.*] Or perhaps, "**and upon the earth distress of nations**" (*i.e.* of the whole world, as the word is regularly used of the Gentile races), being "**in perplexity at the roaring and surging of the sea**" (the type of an unsettled and tumultuous condition of the world), while "**men's hearts**" are "**failing them for fear and for expectation of the things which are coming on the world.**"

26. *for the powers, &c.*] So Matt. xxiv. 29, and Mark xiii. 25.

27 And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.

28 And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.

29 And he spake to them a parable; Behold the fig tree, and all the trees;

30 When they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand.

31 So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.

32 Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled.

33 Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.

34 ¶ And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and *so* that day come upon you unawares.

35 For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth.

36 Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.

37 And in the day time he was teaching in the temple; and at night he went out, and abode in the mount that is called *the mount* of Olives.

38 And all the people came early in the morning to him in the temple, for to hear him.

## CHAPTER XXII.

*1 The Jews conspire against Christ. 3 Satan prepareth Judas to betray him. 7 The apostles prepare the passover. 19 Christ instituteth his holy supper, 21 covertly foretelleth of the traitor, 24 dehorteth the rest of his apostles from ambition. 31 assureth Peter his faith should not fail: 34 and yet he should deny him thrice. 39 He prayeth in the mount, and sweateth blood, 47 is betrayed with a kiss: 50 he healeth Malchus' ear, 54 he is thrice denied of Peter, 63 shamefully abused, 66 and confesseth himself to be the Son of God.*

NOW *f* the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover.

*f* Matt. 26. 2.

---

27. *And then shall they see.*] So Matt. xxiv. 30, and Mark xiii. 26.

28. *And when these.*] In the place of this verse Matthew (xxiv. 31) has another promise of deliverance, "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other:" similarly Mark xiii. 27; this passage appears to support the view taken by Dean Mansel at the end of his note, p. 144, ch. xviii. 31.

31. *the kingdom of God.*] This explains the words of SS. Matthew and Mark, who have merely "it."

33. After this verse St. Luke omits the statement in Matt. xxiv. 36, and Mark xiii. 32, where see note; but a passage closely corresponding to it is found in Acts i. 7, presenting a somewhat remarkable coincidence.

34. *And take heed.*] The practical exhortation to watchfulness (verses 34-36), with which the discourse ends in all the Synoptical Gospels, varies considerably in each. Compare and see notes on Matt. xxiv. 36-42; Mark xiii. 32-37. The lesson is in all cases the same. The parables of Matt. xxv. also belong to this discourse.

35. *as a snare.*] Compare Isai. xxiv. 17.

37. *he was teaching.*] This marks the close of the series of sayings here recorded, before which a similar statement was made by way of preface, ch. xix. 47. We may understand (with Godet, Oosterzee, and Alford) that this closing formula refers in general terms to the last days of our Lord's ministry, and that it applies "to what has been related."

38. *came early in the morning.*] Or, "used to come early in the morning." The last words are no doubt to be understood literally; but the early rising for a given purpose in the idiom of Scripture generally denotes eagerness.

CHAP. XXII.—1–6. COMPACT WITH JUDAS.

1. *drew nigh.*] Or "was drawing nigh." This clause is to be taken closely with ch. xxi. 37, 38. SS. Matthew (xxvi. 2) and Mark

2 And the chief priests and scribes sought how they might kill him; for they feared the people.

3 ¶ [g] Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve.

g Matt. 26. 14.

4 And he went his way, and communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might betray him unto them.

5 And they were glad, and covenanted to give him money.

6 And he promised, and sought opportunity to betray him unto them [1] in the absence of the multitude.

1 Or, *without tumult.*

7 ¶ [h] Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed.

h Matt. 26. 17.

8 And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat.

9 And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare?

10 And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he entereth in.

11 And ye shall say unto the goodman of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?

12 And he shall shew you a large upper room furnished: there make ready.

13 And they went, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

---

(xiv. 1) say that the Passover was "two days" after the great prophecy recorded Matt. xxiv.

*which is called the Passover.*] "The Passover and the unleavened bread" (Mark xiv. 1). The whole paschal week was termed the feast of unleavened bread: the Passover was, strictly speaking, the 15th of Nisan, "the great day of the feast."

**2.** *for they feared.*] See ch. xx. 19. SS. Matthew (xxvi. 5) and Mark (xiv. 2) say here "But they said, not on the feast-day, lest there be an uproar among the people."

**3.** *Then entered Satan.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. xxiv. 14-16; Mark xiv. 10, 11. St. Luke alone of the Synoptists ascribes the temptation of Judas to Satan. But see John xiii. 27; and the note below on v. 27.

**4.** *and captains.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. These were "the captains of the temple" (verse 52; compare Acts iv. 1), charged with the duty of maintaining order within the sacred precincts.

**5.** *money.*] "Thirty pieces of silver:" Matt. xxvi. 15. St. Luke omits the amount, the significance of which would not be perceived by Gentile readers. See Note on the parallel passage on St. Matthew.

**6.** *in the absence of the multitude.*] Lit. "without a crowd." Compare Matt. xxvi. 5; Mark xiv. 2.

7–38. THE LAST SUPPER.

**7.** *day of unleavened bread.*] "The first day of unleavened bread:" Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12.

**8.** *Peter and John.*] St. Luke alone tells us who the messengers were; Mark (xiv. 13) says "two of his disciples." "It was a solemn message, and for it were chosen the two chief Apostles" (Alford). In Matthew and Mark the disciples ask where the Passover is to be prepared: in Luke, our Lord takes the initiative. There is no contradiction, but the narratives are manifestly independent.

**10.** *a man ... bearing a pitcher of water.*] See note on Mark xiv. 13. The particular sign was not without meaning, since the drawing of water by the master of the house, on the eve of the paschal feast, was regarded as a solemn religious act. "According to Jewish usage, on the evening of the 13th [of the month Nisan] before the stars appeared in heaven, every father of a family was to go to the well to draw pure water with which the unleavened bread was kneaded. It was a real rite, which they performed pronouncing the words 'This is the water of the unleavened bread.' Then they lighted a candle, and during part of the following night searched the house, sweeping every corner, to clear away the smallest traces of leavened bread. There is therefore a closer relation than might appear between the sign and its meaning" (Godet).

**11.** *Where is the guest chamber?*] The same word which is translated "inn" ch. ii. 7. See note on Mark xiv. 14.

[i] Matt. 26. 20.

14 [i] And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him.

15 And he said unto them, [1] With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer:

[1] Or, *I have heartily desired.*

16 For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

17 And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide *it* among yourselves:

18 For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.

19 ¶ [k] And he took bread, and

[k] Matt. 26. 26.

---

**14.** *the hour.*] *I.e.* the hour appointed for the paschal supper: "When the even was come," Matt. xxvi. 20; Mark xiv. 17.

*sat down.*] Properly "reclined;" compare Matt. xxvi. 20. According to the Law, the Israelites were to eat the Passover standing (Exod. xii. 11), but later usage had varied from the ancient rule.

*the twelve apostles.*] We should apparently read "**the apostles;**" the numeral having crept into the text from the parallels Matt. xxvi. 20; Mark xiv. 17.

**15.** *With desire I have desired.*] A Hebraising form, meaning "I have greatly desired" (see on verse 10). This short speech, and the action and speech which follow (verses 15-18), are found only in St. Luke. The two other Synoptists record the institution of the Lord's Supper, but not, in distinct terms, this act, viz. the celebration by our Saviour of His last Passover. It will be observed that there is a parallelism between the act here recorded, and the institution of the Lord's Supper, recorded verses 19, 20. Each consists of two parts, eating and drinking. The former is the solemn abrogation of an old feast, as the latter is the solemn institution of a new one. Moreover, as there is a complete parallel between the words of institution as applied to the two elements in the Sacrament, in the form in which they are most fully recorded (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25); so there is a complete parallel between our Lord's words referring to His last Passover and His last paschal cup respectively: compare verses 16, 18: in each He looks forward to the kingdom of God.

*this passover.*] Not merely the ordinance in general, but this particular Passover, since it was to be (verse 16) His last on earth, and indeed, since He was now solemnly abrogating the ordinance, the last Passover which should be celebrated in the world under Divine sanction.

**16.** *fulfilled in the kingdom of God.*] The paschal feastwas typical, and this most solemn Passover was pre-eminently so, of the fulness of joy and perfect communion with God and with each other, which shall be the lot of the faithful in the kingdom of glory, and which is set forth to us in more places than one of Holy Scripture, under the image of a banquet (see verse 30; ch. xiv. 15; Matt. xxii. 1-14; Rev. xix. 9).

**17.** *the cup.*] Or "a cup:" according to the oldest MSS. See Dean Mansel's note at the end of Matt. xxvi. on the question of the connexion between the last Supper and the Passover. This was apparently the first cup customarily drunk at the paschal meal. It was drunk after the master of the house had pronounced a formula of thanksgiving (so here "gave thanks"), some words of which have been thought to be preserved in the expression, "this fruit of the vine." It is argued from the command given to the disciples to divide the cup among themselves, coupled with what is said in the next verse, that our Lord Himself did not drink of it. Neither was it commanded by the Law, as it was required to partake of the paschal lamb. But this supposition is inconsistent with the complete parallelism between verses 15, 16, and verses 17, 18, which has been already noticed. Our Lord desired to partake of the Passover in its integrity, for the last time. After this he institutes a new feast, of which he does not Himself partake, to fill up the void between the abrogated paschal feast and the spiritual feast in the kingdom of God in which it should be fulfilled. Alford observes that the word rendered "he took," which is different from that used verse 15 and in the parallel passages, and which would better be translated "**he received,**" points to the actual partaking of the cup by Jesus Himself.

**19.** *And he took.*] The institution of the Lord's Supper (verses 19, 20) occurs in very similar language in Matt. xxvi. 26-29; Mark xiv. 22-25; and in a form even more closely resembling the text in 1 Cor. xi. 23-25. The close resemblance just referred to points to the connection between St. Luke's Gospel and the teaching of St. Paul. See the notes on the parallel passages referred to. Meyer and De Wette remark that the recitals in St. Luke and 1 Cor. bear a "historical impress." But that appears to be the case

gave thanks, and brake *it*, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.

20 Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup *is* the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.

[a] Matt. 26. 21.

21 ¶ [a]But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me *is* with me on the table.

22 And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined: but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed!

23 And they began to enquire among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing.

24 ¶ And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest.

[b] Matt. 20. 25.

25 [b]And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors.

26 But ye *shall* not *be* so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.

---

simply because these accounts, being the most full of details, have been chiefly followed in the liturgies.

*gave thanks.*] So 1 Cor. xi. 24. Matthew and Mark have "blessed."

*This is my body.*] Thus in all the four accounts: the other three prefix the words "Take, eat."

*which is given.*] The remainder of the verse has no parallel in Matthew or Mark; it occurs in 1 Cor. xi. 24, where, however, instead of "given" we find "broken," according to the received reading, although that is doubtful; see note on that place.

*given.*] Or "being given," *i.e.* it is now on the point of being offered up.

**20.** *Likewise.*] *I.e.* "He took, gave thanks, and gave" (De Wette). See the parallels in Matt. and Mark. Mark adds "they all drank of it."

*after supper.*] So in 1 Cor. xi. 25.

*This cup.*] So in 1 Cor. xi. 25; Matt. and Mark have simply "this;" and Matt. prefixes the injunction "drink ye all of it."

*the new testament in my blood.*] "The new covenant in" (or "by) my blood." So in 1 Cor. xi. 25. Matt. (xxvi. 28, where see note) and Mark have "my blood of the new testament."

*which is shed for you.*] Or "which is being" (*i.e.* "on the point of being:" see note on verse 19) "poured out for you." Matt. and Mark have "for many," and the former adds "for the remission of sins." There is no parallel in 1 Cor. xi. 25, where we read instead "this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." After this follows in Matt. and Mark a solemn declaration closely resembling that in verse 18. See note on Matt. xxvi. 29.

**21.** *But, behold.*] The announcement of Judas' treason is stated earlier in the narrative, and more fully in Matt. xxvi. 21-25, and Mark xiv. 18-21, where see notes. It is also found in a different form in John xiii. 18-29.

*the hand of him.*] Compare Matt. xxvi. 23; Mark xiv. 20; John xiii. 18.

**23.** *And they began.*] Compare Matt. xxvi. 22; Mark xiv. 19; John xiii. 22.

**24.** *And there was also.*] The short narrative before us, in the form in which it appears, is peculiar to St. Luke. Particular expressions occur in it, which are given by the other Evangelists in different contexts. These will be noted as they occur. The strife between the disciples, which is here spoken of, is closely connected by the word "also" with the question (verse 23) who should be the traitor. They passed from the enquiry, who should occupy the lowest position in the kingdom of God, to the enquiry, who should occupy the highest. This was merely the renewal of a contention which had broken out before on more occasions than one. (See ch. ix. 46; Matt. xx. 20, and note on Mark ix. 33.) This incident is no doubt to be connected with the washing of the disciples' feet, mentioned by St. John alone, in close connexion with the treason of Judas (John xiii. 2-29). See note on *v.* 27.

**25.** *The kings.*] Compare and see note on Matt. xx. 25-28.

*are called benefactors.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. Our Lord draws a marked contrast between the potentates who had earned the title of "benefactor" (*e.g.* Ptolemy "Euergetes") by their beneficent rule, and Himself who deserved that title not for exercising authority over His followers but for "serving" them.

27 For whether *is* greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? *is* not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth.

28 Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations.

29 And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me;

30 That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, [c] and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

[c] Matt. 19. 28.

31 ¶ And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, [d] Satan hath desired *to have* you, that he may sift *you* as wheat:

[d] 1 Pet. 5. 8.

32 But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.

33 And he said unto him, Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death.

34 [e] And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.

[e] Matt. 26. 34.

35 [f] And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and

[f] Matt. 10. 9.

---

**27.** *as he that serveth.*] The saying is intelligible upon the supposition that it followed or accompanied the act of washing the disciples' feet; and therefore it shews that the whole incident and conversation is suitable to its position in this Gospel: the same remark applies, as Alford shews, to the declaration in verse 28, which could not well have been uttered except at the very close of our Saviour's ministry. This is a striking instance of the frequent coincidences between the third and fourth Gospels. See Renan, 'Les Évangiles,' p. 266, and the Additional Note on ch. ix. 51.

**28.** *temptations.*] Or "**trials:**" compare James i. 2, 3.

**30.** *eat and drink.*] See note on verse 16.

*sit on thrones.*] Compare Matt. xix. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.

**31.** *And the Lord said.*] These words are wanting in the Vatican and two other less important MSS; they are, however, found in the great majority of ancient MSS and versions. It is conceivable that they were inserted to relieve the discourse of its appearance of abruptness. The question arises whether we have here another report of the prediction recorded Matt. xxvi. 33-35; Mark xiv. 29-31, or whether the denial of Peter was twice foretold. In any case there is a true parallel to the text in John xiii. 38. Matthew and Mark tell us that a warning was given on the way to Gethsemane; Luke and John represent one to have been already uttered at the last supper. Were there two warnings, or one? Olshausen, Oosterzée, Alford (who is never very anxious to harmonise) accept the former supposition; De Wette, Meyer, Bleek, and Godet the latter. There is certainly nothing to forbid our supposing that St. Peter made two protestations of zeal in his master's service, and that these were followed by two similar warnings. Peter's two professions, as Alford has pointed out, differ materially. He first declares his willingness to suffer with Jesus; and then asserts that whatever may be the case with others, he would never be offended.

*Simon, Simon, &c.*] Or, "**Simon, Simon, behold, Satan obtained you** (plural) **that he might sift you as wheat; but I** (emphatic) **prayed for thee** (singular) **that thy faith fail not, and thou, when thou hast turned** (*i.e.* to God) **confirm thy brethren.**" Our Lord here tells Peter that Satan had asked for the Apostles to test and try them (compare Job i. 12), and to winnow the chaff from the grain (compare Amos ix. 9): one had already failed before the test; Peter, from his impulsive character, was at the same time in greater danger than the rest, and, if victorious over the impending temptation, certain to be a strength and support to the others. A temporary failure, and future recovery, assured by the Saviour's prayer, and attested by the expression "when thou art converted."

**33.** *Lord, I am ready, &c.*] Or, "**Lord, with thee** (emphatic) **I am ready to go,**" &c. Compare "Lord, cannot I follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake" (John xiii. 37).

**34.** *shall not crow.*] Mark alone (xiv. 30, where see note) says "twice."

**35.** *And he said.*] Our Lord now turns to the Apostles generally. The short conversation which follows (verses 35-38) is peculiar to Luke. The passage, both in itself and in the abruptness of its introduction, bears every mark of originality and reality. Our Lord draws a contrast between the favour with which His emissaries were everywhere received in their mission recorded ch. ix. 1-10 (compare ch. x. 1-20), and the troubles

scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing.

36 Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take *it*, and likewise *his* scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.

37 For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, [g] And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end.

[g] Isai. 53. 12.

38 And they said, Lord, behold, here *are* two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough.

39 ¶ [h] And he came out, and went, as he was wont, to the mount of Olives; and his disciples also followed him.

[h] Matt. 26. 36.

40 [i] And when he was at the place, he said unto them, Pray that ye enter not into temptation.

[i] Matt. 26. 41.

41 And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed,

42 Saying, Father, if thou be

---

which awaited them in their future course, and which would immediately commence. It is as if He had said, "The time of trial is at hand, and all earthly means are necessary for your support and defence."

**37.** *For I say.*] The previous warning has mainly reference to the trials and persecutions through which the followers of Jesus should hereafter be called to pass; but the beginning of persecutions was to commence at once, and to this He now refers.

*for the things, &c.*] Or, "**for the things concerning me too have an end.**" Variously explained of the things written concerning Christ, which (*e.g.* that just quoted) are to be accomplished, as well as other prophecies (so Bengel, De Wette, Olshausen, Oosterzee, and most commentators); or thus, "for also the things which befal me have an end"—"are approaching their termination" (Meyer, who with the original text compares Mark iii. 26). Probably we are to accept the former explanation.

**38.** *two swords.*] In the excitement of the time, and after warnings of danger, it is conceivable that some of the disciples may have taken the precaution of arming themselves. The disciples utterly misunderstood our Lord's warning, and, as on a former occasion (Matt. xvi. 6, 7), interpreted His words quite literally. To their announcement He replies in sad irony, "It is enough." It is not necessary, with De Wette, to give the words a double meaning. Our Lord means to intimate that the speakers had no conception as yet of the amount of opposition which they would have to encounter.

39–46. THE AGONY IN GETHSEMANE.

**39.** *and went.*] Compare and see notes on Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26; John xviii. 1.

*as he was wont.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. Compare ch. xxi. 37; John xviii. 2.

**40.** *at the place.*] The account of the agony in the garden (verse 40-46) wanting in John, is given more fully in Matt. xxvi. 36-46; Mark xiv. 32-42; where see notes.

*Pray that ye.*] Our Lord had already (verse 31) warned the Apostles of the sifting trial through which they would have to pass. What more natural than that He should urge them to prayer at this point, in obedience to the example which He was about to give them (see the virtually parallel passages, Matt. xxvi. 36; Mark xiv. 32). SS. Matthew and Mark, on the one hand, and Luke, on the other, preserve different halves of the tradition. The injunction quoted by SS. Matthew and Mark (see references) is really recorded by St. Luke lower down (verse 45).

**41.** *withdrawn.*] Literally "torn away." In Acts xxi. 1, the same word (which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T.) is rendered "we were gotten from" them. In each case the context justifies the notion that a reluctant departure, accompanied by a certain mental effort, is signified (so it is understood by Meyer, Godet, Oosterzee, Olshausen). Such, too, is the general meaning of the original word, though it occurs in 2 Macc. xii. 10, without any such ethical force, and may here possibly mean nothing more than withdrawal.

*about a stone's cast.*] Peculiar to St. Luke; it tells us that he was within hearing of His disciples in the still night.

*kneeled down.*] "Fell on the ground" (Mark xiv. 35) "on his face" (Matt. xxvi. 39). Those Evangelists record the withdrawal of Peter, James, and John from the other Apostles.

**42.** *Father, if, &c.*] Rather, "**Father, if thou wilt remove this cup from me—well; nevertheless,**" &c. This is doubtless the true reading and translation. The sentence is interrupted. The three Synoptists give the prayer somewhat differently: but all

willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.

43 And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him.

44 And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

45 And when he rose up from prayer, and was come to his disciples, he found them sleeping for sorrow,

46 And said unto them, Why sleep ye? rise and pray, lest ye enter into temptation.

47 ¶ And while he yet spake, [a]behold a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them, and drew near unto Jesus to kiss him.

[a] Matt. 26 47.

48 But Jesus said unto him, Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?

49 When they which were about him saw what would follow, they said unto him, Lord, shall we smite with the sword?

50 ¶ And one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear.

51 And Jesus answered and said,

---

agree in the image of the "cup" (compare Matt. xx. 22), and SS. Mark and Luke use the same verb for "remove," while St. Matthew employs a cognate word. The words of our Lord recorded by St. John xviii. 11 refer to the cup, thus presenting a striking coincidence. All alike record the Saviour's act of resignation.

**43.** *And there appeared.*] These two verses (43, 44) are peculiar to St. Luke. They are, however, wanting in some of the most important MSS, and are marked with notes of doubtful genuineness in others. They were regarded as doubtful in very early times, but the facts which they relate, and which are found nowhere else, have the testimony of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Hippolytus. It is scarcely conceivable that they should have been inserted without authority.

*an angel.*] There can be no doubt that the historian intends by this the actual and visible appearance of an angel.

*strengthening him.*] The Greek word is specially used of physical support, such as our Lord's human body needed, such as on one other occasion, closely connected with this, was given after, not during, temptation, by ministering angels; cf. Matt. iv. 11. There is no reference here to spiritual strengthening, which might justly be regarded as incompatible with our Lord's Divinity.

**44.** *and his sweat.*] We are not to take this as the statement of an event following in order that recorded in the previous verse, but rather as an explanation, accounting for the visit of the angel (Meyer, Oosterzee). It is not clear, however, whether we are to understand the comparison, "as it were great drops of blood," to refer merely to the great size and thickness of the drops which fell (Euthymius, Theophylact, Kuinöl, Olshausen), or whether they presented the appearance of natural blood (as Calvin, Bengel, Meyer, De Wette, Godet, and Oosterzee). On the whole, we are disposed to accept the latter interpretation. Oosterzee remarks on this description that it is "a trait characteristic of the physician."

**45.** *And when he rose.*] In these two verses (45, 46) St. Luke sums up St. Matthew's and St. Mark's account of the repeated visits of our Lord to His disciples and of His tender expostulations with them (Matt. xxvi. 40-46; Mark xiv. 37-42; where see notes).

47–53. THE ARREST.

**47.** *to kiss him.*] Matt. (xxvi. 48) and Mark (xiv. 44) explain that this was the sign agreed upon.

**48.** *Judas, betrayest thou?*] Peculiar to St. Luke. Matthew has in this place, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" The words, "with a kiss" are emphatic. The token of love is become the instrument of treachery.

**49.** *When they which.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. The enigmatical warning of our Lord (verse 36) was doubtless in their thoughts.

**50.** *one of them.*] So Matthew and Mark. From St. John alone (xviii. 10) we learn that it was Peter, and that the servant's name was Malchus.

*right ear.*] So in John xviii. 10: Matt. and Mark simply say "his ear."

**51.** *And Jesus answered.*] The words which follow, and the miracle, are peculiar to Luke the Physician. St. Matthew (xxvi. 52-

Suffer ye thus far. And he touched his ear, and healed him.

52 Then Jesus said unto the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and the elders, which were come to him, Be ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and staves?

53 When I was daily with you in the temple, ye stretched forth no hands against me: but this is your hour, and the power of darkness.

54 ¶ [l]Then took they him, and led *him*, and brought him into the high priest's house. And Peter followed afar off.

[l] Matt. 26. 57.

55 [m]And when they had kindled

[m] Matt. 26. 69.

---

54) and St. John (xviii. 11) give here our Lord's rebuke to Peter, and His determination to bear what is coming upon Him.

*Suffer ye thus far.*] It is not easy to say whether we are to understand these words as addressed to the multitude, or to the disciples. If in the former way, it is most natural to take them as a request to leave the Captive at liberty, until He had healed the wounded man. So De Wette, Oosterzee, and Alford, who sees here an undesigned coincidence, since Matthew and Mark (but not Luke) tell us that Jesus was apprehended before Malchus was wounded. Meyer, Bleek, Kuinöl, Olshausen, Trench, and Godet regard the words as addressed to the disciples: "Let them (the multitude) proceed thus far." Thus, too, Augustin, 'De Cons. Ev.' 3, 5. This interpretation is grounded, partly upon the word "answered," which, it is contended, must bear relation to the previous question of the disciples (but we frequently find the word "answered" in the Gospels, without relation to any previously spoken words); and partly on the ground that the exhortation is a virtual equivalent to the longer speech given by St. Matthew in this place (Matt. xxvi. 52-54). On the last ground, and because the next words of Jesus (verses 52, 53) are addressed to His captors, we incline doubtfully to this interpretation.

**52.** *chief priests.*] See note on Matt. xxvii. 1. Luke alone mentions them among the captors of Jesus. Bleek and Meyer see an improbability in the account of their presence. Yet it is quite conceivable that some of them may have been attracted to the spot by curiosity and malice (Godet: so also Kuinöl). The expression 'which were come to Him' seems to imply that they came after the arrest, possibly to receive our Lord on the return of His captors.

*captains of the temple.*] See on verse 4.

*Be ye come out?*] So Matt. xxvi. 55; and Mark xiv. 48.

**53.** *but this is your hour, &c.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. This passage is variously interpreted, according to the meaning to be assigned to "darkness." Bleek, De Wette, Godet, and others take it in the physical sense, and understand the passage thus: "You did not take me when I was with you daily in the temple; but this is the time most favourable to your evil deeds, and darkness gives you courage and strength to perform them." By Kuinöl, Meyer, Olshausen, and Oosterzee, "darkness" is understood in the ethical sense, though Meyer sees in it an allusion to the hour at which Jesus was apprehended: "This is YOUR (emphatic) hour (the time which God has given you to triumph in) and this (*i. e.* this power by which you work) is the power of darkness" (Meyer). This is probably the true meaning, but three points deserve notice. First, the word translated "power," means "authority," and is used of a delegated or conceded authority (see John xix. 10, 11). It appears to stand in this place for the temporary licence given by God to the powers of evil. Then, darkness (as Olshausen shews) does not mean Sin, or Satan, but the power of evil generally as opposed to God and to all that is good. Lastly, the Synoptists agree in recording our Lord's reproach against the Jewish authorities for neglecting to take Him into custody when He gave them opportunities, and in giving an explanation of their neglect. Matthew and Mark say, "*but* . . . that the Scriptures might be fulfilled;" Luke says, in effect, "*but* this is the hour which God has given you, and this is the authority conceded to the powers of darkness." All agree in ascribing the previous non-interference and present action of the Jews to God's Providence.

### 54-71. The Trial in the House of Caiaphas.

**54.** *the high priest's house.*] On the question as to the residence of the high priest, and the person so designated, see notes on ch. iii. 2, and on Matt. xxvi. 57; Mark xiv. 53.

**55.** *And when they.*] The denials of St. Peter which follow (verses 55-62) are related, somewhat variously, by the four Evangelists (Matt. xxvi. 69-75; Mark xiv. 66-72; John xviii. 17-27; where see notes). It is to be observed that whereas SS. Matthew and Mark mention the proceedings before the high priest, and the insults offered

a fire in the midst of the hall, and were set down together, Peter sat down among them.

56 But a certain maid beheld him as he sat by the fire, and earnestly looked upon him, and said, This man was also with him.

57 And he denied him, saying, Woman, I know him not.

58 And after a little while another saw him, and said, Thou art also of them. And Peter said, Man, I am not.

59 And about the space of one hour after another confidently affirmed, saying, Of a truth this *fellow* also was with him: for he is a Galilæan.

60 And Peter said, Man, I know not what thou sayest. And immediately, while he yet spake, the cock crew.

61 And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice.

62 And Peter went out, and wept bitterly.

63 ¶ And the men that held Jesus mocked him, and smote *him*.

64 And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face, and asked him, saying, Prophesy, who is it that smote thee?

65 And many other things blasphemously spake they against him.

66 ¶ [a]And as soon as it was day,

[a] Matt. 27. 1.

---

to our Lord, before the denials of Peter, St. Luke inverts the order of recital in order to bring all the incidents of one transaction into a single connected narrative: this is in accordance with his practice · see note on ch. iii. 19. St. John, who places the questioning of our Lord by the high priest between St. Peter's first and second denial, gives the order of events with the greatest accuracy.

*kindled a fire.*] Compare Mark xiv. 54, 67; John xviii. 18, 25.

**56.** *a certain maid.*] So Matt. xxvi. 69: "one of the maids of the high priest" (Mark xiv. 66): "the damsel that kept the door" (John xviii. 17). According to St. Mark, the first crowing of the cock followed the first denial: St. John (see on verse 55) places an interval between this denial and the next.

**58.** *another.*] A man, as the gender of the original word shews. "Another (maid)" Matt. xxvi. 71: "a maid," or rather "the maid:" Mark xiv. 69: in John xviii. 25, the subject of the verb is plural, but indeterminate,—"they said."

**59.** *about the space, &c.*] The note of time, as well as that in verse 58, is peculiar to St. Luke, and characteristic of him.

*another.*] Here also masculine. In Matt. xxvi. 73, and Mark xiv. 70, the third accusation is ascribed to the by-standers. According to John xviii. 26, the man was a slave of the high priest, and a kinsman of Malchus.

*a Galilæan.*] "Thy speech bewrayeth thee" (Matt. xxvi. 73) or "agreeth thereto" (Mark xiv. 70). In John xviii. 26, the slave recognises Peter, as having seen him in the garden.

**60.** *while he yet spake.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. Mark (xiv. 72) adds, "the second time."

**61.** *And the Lord turned, &c.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. This could not have been during the trial, since Peter was in the court without; there can be little doubt that at the moment when the third denial occurred, our Lord was crossing the court on the way from the house of Caiaphas.

**63.** *And the men.*] With the account of the mocking of Jesus (verses 63-65) compare, and see notes on Matt. xxvi. 67, 68; Mark xiv. 65.

**65.** *And many other, &c.*] Peculiar to St. Luke.

**66.** *And as soon.*] The three Synoptical Evangelists agree that a meeting of the Sanhedrim was held at daybreak (compare, and see notes on, Matt. xxvii. 1, 2; Mark xv. 1). But the questions of the high priest and our Lord's replies, here given by St. Luke, are recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark as having been spoken at the house of Caiaphas. It is possible that the same scene may have been re-enacted in the Sanhedrim, and that the high priest having, as he thought, drawn from our Lord's own lips satisfactory proof of His guilt, was anxious to elicit the same answers, and therefore asked the same questions, in the presence of the Council. But it is also possible either that St. Luke, who

the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and led him into their council, saying,

67 Art thou the Christ? tell us. And he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe:

68 And if I also ask *you*, ye will not answer me, nor let *me* go.

69 Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.

70 Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, [a] Ye say that I am.

[a] Mark 14. 62.

71 And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

1 *Jesus is accused before Pilate, and sent to Herod.* 8 *Herod mocketh him.* 12 *Herod and Pilate are made friends.* 13 *Barabbas is desired of the people, and is loosed by Pilate, and Jesus is given to be crucified.* 27 *He telleth the women, that lament him, the destruction of Jerusalem:* 34 *prayeth for his enemies.* 39 *Two evildoers are crucified with him.* 46 *His death.* 50 *His burial.*

AND the whole multitude of them arose, and led him unto Pilate.

2 And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this *fellow* perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a king.

3 [a] And Pilate asked him, saying,

[a] Matt. 27. 11.

---

gives no particulars of the enquiry in the high priest's house, may have transferred some of its incidents to the later enquiry here related, or that the contrary process may have taken place in the other Gospels.

*the elders of the people.*] Properly, "the presbytery of the people,"—the body of elders: *i.e.* the Sanhedrim. The same expression occurs Acts xxii. 5.

**67.** *And he said.*] The former part of the answer (verses 67, 68) is found here only.

**68.** *And if I also.*] The questions supposed, must be such as those recorded ch. xx. 1-8, 41-44, questions by which He might prove His adversaries in the wrong. De Wette observes that to ask questions is unsuitable to the position of an accused person. But it is not unsuitable to our Lord's bearing towards His judges, both Jewish and heathen.

**69.** *Hereafter.*] Or, *From henceforth.* The kingdom is here spoken of as being about to be immediately inaugurated, since our Lord's Cross is regarded as the first step to the throne of His glory (see on ch. ix. 51). Compare, and see notes on, Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; where, however, the glorious Advent is spoken of, as here the Session in glory.

**70.** *Then said they.*] SS. Matthew (xxvi. 63) and Mark (xiv. 61) unite the two questions (verses 67, 70), and give the answer in this verse as the reply to both.

### CHAP. XXIII.—1-7. THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE.

**1.** *And the whole multitude of them.*] Or, "the whole number of them," that is to say, of the elders of the people, mentioned in ch. xxii. 66. The word here translated "multitude" is different from that which is so frequently thus rendered, and which signifies "crowd," or almost "mob." Compare Matt. xxvii. 1, 2; Mark xv. 1; John xviii. 28. Matthew here mentions the fate of Judas (Matt. xxvii. 3-10). In the trial-scene before Pilate which follows (verses 2-25) St. Luke is full of minute detail, and diverges considerably from the first two Evangelists (Matt. xxvii. 11-26; Mark xv. 2-15), who keep close together, while St. John (xviii. 28 -xix. 16) records quite different matter.

**2.** *forbidding to give tribute.*] This charge was utterly false (compare ch. xx. 20-26), but was closely connected with the partly true charge which immediately follows. The enemies of our Lord vary their accusation in accordance with the court before which they plead: before the Sanhedrim it is blasphemy: before Pilate, it is treason.

*Christ a king.*] The last word is added to explain the Jewish term to the Roman governor. "This translation of the title of Christ into that of king, before Pilate, is worthy of notice, as compared with the change of the same title into that of Son of God before the Sanhedrim" (Godet).

**3.** *And Pilate, &c.*] We learn from John (xviii. 33-38) that the same question was put by Pilate and answered more fully, in consequence of which Pilate twice pronounced Jesus innocent (John xviii. 38; xix. 4). This explains the sentence of acquittal in verse 4, which is scarcely intelligible without it.

Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest *it*.

4 Then said Pilate to the chief priests and *to* the people, I find no fault in this man.

5 And they were the more fierce, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place.

6 When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether the man were a Galilæan.

7 And as soon as he knew that he belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem at that time.

8 ¶ And when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he was desirous to see him of a long *season*, because he had heard many things of him; and he hoped to have seen some miracle done by him.

9 Then he questioned with him in many words; but he answered him nothing.

10 And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused him.

11 And Herod with his men of war set him at nought, and mocked *him*, and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe, and sent him again to Pilate.

12 ¶ And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves.

13 ¶ [b] And Pilate, when he had called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people,

[b] Matt. 27. 23.

14 Said unto them, Ye have brought this man unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and, behold, I, having examined *him* before

---

**5.** *were the more fierce.*] Literally "strengthened;" *i.e.* either "pressed the charge more strongly," or more probably "waxed stronger:" the latter would be equivalent to the Authorised rendering. So the Vulgate and most commentators.

*teaching throughout all Jewry, &c.*] This reference to our Lord's teaching throughout Judæa is explained by St. Luke's account of the interval between the departure from Galilee and the arrival at Jerusalem; it coincides very strikingly with the statements of St. John. See also Acts x. 36-38; and the Additional Note on ch. ix. 51.

8–12. Trial before Herod.

**7.** *Herod's jurisdiction.*] That of Antipas: ch. iii. 1. There is no notice of our Lord's appearance before Herod in the other Evangelists. St. Luke on many occasions shews a remarkable acquaintance with matters relating to Herod Antipas: see note on Mark xvi. 1. Pilate was in a difficulty, being unwilling on the one hand to offend the Jews, and, on the other, to condemn an innocent man (verse 4), and therefore hoped to escape from his responsibility by leaving the case in the hands of Herod as ruler of Galilee (Meyer). It is probable that he also wished, as a matter of public policy, to treat Herod with deference and courtesy (compare verse 12). The word here rendered *sent* is accurately used to express the transfer of a case to a court of competent jurisdiction.

*at that time.*] Literally, "**in those days;**" being the time of the Passover.

**8.** *he was desirous.*] The curiosity of Herod with regard to our Lord is also referred to by St. Luke alone, ch. ix. 7-9.

**9.** *he answered him nothing.*] Our Lord's silence is accounted for by His knowledge of Herod's character and motives: compare ch. xiii. 32.

**11.** *gorgeous.*] Or "**shining;**" *i.e.* apparently, not purple, or scarlet, as in Matt. xxvii. 28; John xix. 2; but shining white (as in Acts x. 30, where the original expression is the same), in allusion to the claim to kingly dignity.

**12.** *made friends.*] "Judaism and Heathenism began to unite at the birth of Christianity" (Bengel).

*at enmity.*] The cause of the quarrel is unknown: it probably arose out of some question of jurisdiction. (Compare ch. xiii. 1.)

**14.** *Ye have brought.*] Properly, "**ye brought.**"

*have found, &c.*] Or, "**found in this man no guilt of the things whereof ye accuse him.**" Compare verse 4.

**15.** *for I sent you to him.*] Or, according to the oldest MSS and late editors, "for he

you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him:

15 No, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him; and, lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him.

16 I will therefore chastise him, and release *him*.

17 (For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)

18 And they cried out all at once, saying, Away with this *man*, and release unto us Barabbas:

19 (Who for a certain sedition made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison.)

20 Pilate therefore, willing to release Jesus, spake again to them.

21 But they cried, saying, Crucify *him*, crucify him.

22 And he said unto them the third time, Why, what evil hath he done? I have found no cause of death in him: I will therefore chastise him, and let *him* go.

23 And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified. And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed.

24 And Pilate [1]gave sentence that it should be as they required.

25 And he released unto them him that for sedition and murder was cast into prison, whom they had desired; but he delivered Jesus to their will.

26 [c]And as they led him away, they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on him they laid the cross, that he might bear *it* after Jesus.

27 ¶ And there followed him a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him.

28 But Jesus turning unto them said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children.

29 For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed *are* the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck.

30 [d]Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us.

31 [e]For if they do these things

[1] Or, *assented.*
[c] Matt. 27. 32.
[d] Isai. 2. 19. Hos. 10. 8. Rev. 6. 16.
[e] 1 Pet. 4. 17.

sent him back to me." But the reading here adopted is supported by other MSS and versions of high authority.

*is done unto him.*] Rather, "**hath been done by him.**"

**17.** *For of necessity, &c.*] The genuineness of the verse is very doubtful. It is wanting in A B, and some other uncial MSS, and in some Versions. It is found in ℵ, and (after verse 19) in D, and in the greater number of MSS and versions. There is much confusion in the readings at this point. It may very possibly have been inserted from Matt. xxvii. 15. On this account it is omitted by Griesbach, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. Lachmann retains it, but marks it as doubtful. If it is not genuine, we find a remarkable coincidence between the Evangelists, St. Matthew alone explaining the ground of the popular demand. But, on the whole, the weight of probability inclines in favour of the text as it stands.

**18.** *all at once.*] Literally "in full number," *i.e.* both Chief Priests and rulers and people (verse 13).

**22.** *I have found, &c.*] Compare verses 14, 16.

**25.** *him that, &c.*] St. Luke substitutes this description for the name of Barabbas in order to mark indignation: compare Acts iii. 16.

**26.** *after Jesus.*] This trait is peculiar to St. Luke.

**27.** *And there followed.*] What follows (verses 27-32) is peculiar to St. Luke. The women here spoken of are not those who followed Jesus from Galilee (verse 55), but, as our Lord's words shew (verse 28), women of Jerusalem, who felt sympathy with Him. It is plain in the original that the words "which also" refer to the women only; accordingly these only are addressed in the following verse.

**29.** *Blessed, &c.*] With the form of expression compare ch. xi. 27.

**31.** *For if, &c.*] If the Romans deal thus with an innocent person among the Jews, how will they treat the guilty people? In the form of expression there is possibly an

in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?

32 [f] And there were also two other, malefactors, led with him, to be put to death.

f Matt. 27. 38.

33 And when they were come to the place, which is called [1] Calvary, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left.

1 Or, *the place of a skull.*

34 ¶ Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.

35 And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also with them derided *him*, saying, He saved others; let him save himself, if he be Christ, the chosen of God.

36 And the soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, and offering him vinegar,

37 And saying, If thou be the king of the Jews, save thyself.

38 And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

39 ¶ And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him,

---

allusion to Ezekiel xx. 47 (compare Ezek. xxi. 3, 4).

**32.** *two other.*] Only mentioned by Luke at this point: see verses 33, 39.

**33.** *Calvary.*] Or "skull." Compare and see notes on Matt. xxvii. 33; Mark xv. 22; John xix. 17: in all those places the original name of Golgotha appears, and is interpreted "place of a skull:" St. Luke, writing for Gentiles, omits the Hebrew name altogether.

*they crucified him, &c.*] Compare John xix. 17, 18. They assign to Jesus the place of honour in mockery, as to the king of the Jews.

**34.** *Then said Jesus . . . they do.*] These words are omitted in B D and in א as altered by a later hand. But they appear in A C, and are quoted by Irenæus and later Fathers. They may have been omitted in order to bring the narrative into closer harmony with the other Gospels, as they do not appear elsewhere; while their insertion, if not genuine, is less easily accounted for. They are marked as doubtful by Lachmann; but are accepted as genuine by Tischendorf, and most editors; see also Renan, 'Les Évangiles,' p. 266. Godet remarks that the words of the penitent thief (verses 40–42) can hardly be explained except by the impression which the prayer of Jesus had produced on him. The question has been asked, for whom our Lord prayed. Ancient commentators generally, Bengel, Kuinöl, Ewald, and others, say, the Roman soldiers, with especial reference to the close of the prayer: Meyer, His enemies, specially the Jews: this has strong support in St. Peter's words, recorded by St. Luke, Acts iii. 17, "I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as *did* also your rulers:" and in St. Paul's specific statement, 1 Cor. ii. 8: "for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." Both passages seem evidently to refer to these words of our Lord. Bengel observes that the first and the last prayer of Jesus on the cross begin with "Father" (verse 46).

**35.** *the rulers also with them.*] The words "with them," before "derided," are not found in the best MSS, and are rightly omitted by late editors: thus the mockery, according to Luke, would be that of the rulers, to whom indeed the words given in this verse are assigned in the first two Gospels.

*if he be.*] Or, "**if this man be.**" The particular pronoun here used marks contempt.

**36.** *And the soldiers, &c.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. The soldiers were engaged in their mid-day meal at the foot of the cross, and offered our Lord the sour wine served out to them with their rations. See critical note on Matt. xxvii. 34. Their words of mockery are reported by St. Luke alone. They echo those of the rulers (verse 35), but translate them. It is no longer "the Christ" but "the king of the Jews."

**38.** *And a superscription, &c.*] Compare Matt. xxvii. 37 (where see note); Mark xv. 26; John xix. 19–22. The words "in letters of Hebrew and Greek and Latin" are omitted in some of the best MSS, but rest on sufficient authority.

**39.** *And one of, &c.*] Matthew (xxvii. 44) and Mark (xv. 32) ascribe mockery to those who were crucified with Him. They speak in more general terms; and do not record the conversation (verses 39–44) so minutely detailed by St. Luke, who in this, as in many other important instances, gives further particulars of our Lord's sayings than the earlier gospels. On the whole this appears to be a sufficient explanation of the apparent discre-

saying, If thou be Christ, save thyself and us.

40 But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?

41 And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss.

42 And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.

43 And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise.

---

pancy, though good arguments are alleged by those who consider that both the thieves at first reviled our Lord, and that one of them afterwards, moved by our Lord's demeanour and specially by His prayer for the murderers, rebuked his fellow for doing so. A similar generality in the narrative will be found in ch. xxiv. 33-40; and especially Mark xvi. 14; compared with John xx. 19-29.

*saying, If thou be Christ.*] We ought apparently to read with the majority of uncial MSS, "**Art thou not the Christ?**" Bengel thinks that the impenitent thief was a Jew, the penitent a Gentile, because the former speaks of "Christ," and the latter (like the soldiers, verse 36) of the "kingdom." But the parallel is not complete. The soldiers, like Pilate, had spoken of Jesus as "king of the Jews:" and the idea of a kingdom was asociated in the Jewish mind with that of the Christ. The prayer in verse 42, and probably also the rebuke in verse 40, could only have proceeded from a Jew.

**40.** *Dost not thou fear God?*] Or, "**Dost not thou**" (emphatic) "**even fear God?**" There is a double emphasis in this clause, one resting on the pronoun "thou" (as marked by the use of the pronoun in the original), and the other on the conjunction here translated "even," which throws a stress upon "fear," or rather upon the complete expression "fear God:" as if the speaker had said "Dost thou not so much as fear God? thou, above all, who art a partner in this torture, and not a mere spectator of it, like the jeering multitude?" so Meyer.

**41.** *for we receive, &c.*] Literally, "For we are receiving back things worthy of what we did:" the verb which we here translate "did," having special reference to the moral aspect of actions.

*but this, &c.*] Or, "**but this one did nothing amiss.**" On the last word Meyer remarks that "the very general expression marks innocence all the more strongly."

**42.** *And he said, &c.*] The text is well supported, but late editors adopt a different reading, viz., "And he said, Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom." The faith of the penitent thief looked forward not merely to a kingdom of the Christ, but to a kingdom beyond the grave, since he could see the Sovereign of that kingdom in one who was at the point of death. He believed in the coming of the Christ, not *into* his kingdom, as the Authorised Version would lead us to understand, but to earth, He being already in His kingdom—invested with the kingly dignity (compare Matt. xxv. 31 where the Son of Man, called below "the king," is said to "come in his glory"). Meyer observes, in answer to a captious objection, "The thief must have become acquainted with the predictions of Jesus concerning His coming, which may very easily have been the case at Jerusalem, and does not directly presuppose any instructions on the part of Jesus; although he may also have heard Him himself, and still remembered what he heard. The extraordinary character of his painful position in the very face of death, produced as a consequence an extraordinary action of firm faith in those predictions." The common statement that his faith surpassed that of the Apostles at this time may be accepted, but with some reservation; see Matt. xx. 20; Mark x. 37, and note on the latter passage.

**43.** *To day.*] This is the emphatic word, and it is to be taken with what follows. So all the best commentators, ancient and modern, including Cornelius a Lapide and other Romanists, though the text, taken according to the more obvious meaning of the words, appears to leave no room for Purgatory. An old but forced construction connects it with the preceding words, "I say." The thief had looked forward to the return of Jesus in glory, some time after His death, and he hoped that he would not then be forgotten. Jesus assures Him of immediate bliss in His own presence.

*paradise.*] The word, which is of Persian origin, properly means a park or garden. It is used (Gen. ii. 8, LXX Version) of the garden of Eden. It is also used in two other places of the N. T., viz., 2 Cor. xii. 4, where it seems to be equivalent (verse 2) to "the third heaven," and Rev. ii. 7, where from the mention of "the tree of life" it is apparently the same as the restored Eden figured in Rev. xxi.,

44 And it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the [1]earth until the ninth hour.

[1] Or, *land*.

45 And the sun was darkened, and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst.

46 ¶ And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, [g]Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.

[g] Ps. 31. 5.

47 Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man.

48 And all the people that came together to that sight, beholding the things which were done, smote their breasts, and returned.

49 And all his acquaintance, and the women that followed him from Galilee, stood afar off, beholding these things.

50 ¶ [h]And, behold, *there was* a man named Joseph, a counsellor; *and he was* a good man, and a just;

[h] Matt. 27. 57.

51 (The same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them;) *he was* of Arimathæa, a city of the Jews: who also himself waited for the kingdom of God.

---

xxii. as the New Jerusalem. The language of our Lord is general, and figurative, but yet, as we cannot doubt, in full accordance with the truth concerning the unseen world. "We are not to understand by this paradise, the heavenly paradise, 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7; but a part of Sheol, opposed to Gehenna, and called indifferently paradise and Abraham's bosom [compare ch. xvi. 22]. He to whom this promise was made could have understood nothing else: and the Lord, who from the moment of His death till His resurrection, remained in the separate state, could have intended nothing else" (Oosterzee).

**44.** *And it was, &c.*] Compare Matt. xxvii. 45 (where see note); Mark xv. 33. Perhaps we ought to read, *and it was already about*, &c. The language of St. Luke, as usual, is more exact as regards time, than that of SS. Matthew and Mark. The other Evangelists give us other particulars of our Saviour's death (Matt. xxvii. 46-50; Mark xv. 34-37; John xix. 28-33); St. Luke, with his usual sparingness of details, hurries to the conclusion.

**45.** *And the sun was darkened.*] Peculiar to St. Luke. It is added to explain the phenomenon mentioned in the previous verse.

*and the veil.*] The other Synoptists mention this portent, both in the same words, and immediately after the death of Christ. St. Luke mentions it before, and in different words, shewing evidently that his account is independent. There is no contradiction, as neither of the Evangelists tells us at what point this event occurred.

**46.** *loud voice.*] Compare Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37: the words are not given by the other Evangelists.

*Father, into, &c.*] From Psalm xxxi. 5. A distinct trace of these last words is found in John xix. 30, "gave up the ghost," or, rather, "yielded up," or "handed over," "his spirit."

**47.** *he glorified God.*] Peculiar to St. Luke.

*a righteous man.*] A Gentile rendering of the words found in Matthew and Mark—"the Son of God."

**48.** *And all the people, &c.*] Or, "**and all the multitudes**" (or "crowds") "**which had come together for that sight**" (or "spectacle"), "**when they had seen what took place**" (the earthquake, darkness, &c.), "**turned back, smiting their breasts**" (in token of penitence. Compare Acts ii. 37).

**49.** *And all, &c.*] Or, "**but all,**" &c.; as distinguished from the multitudes just spoken of. Matthew (xxvii. 55, 56) and Mark (xv. 40, 41) mention the women here spoken of, and name some of them: compare also John xix. 25-27.

*from Galilee.*] Compare, and see note on, ch. viii. 2, 3.

### 50–54. The Burial.

**50.** *a counsellor.*] *I.e.* a member of the Sanhedrim; "an honourable counsellor" (Mark xv. 43).

*a good man, &c.*] This and the next clause are peculiar to St. Luke. The Evangelist, having just told us that Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrim, is careful to explain that he had taken no part in the condemnation of Jesus. St. John alone (ch. xix. 39) tells us that Nicodemus also took part in our Lord's burial.

**51.** *who also himself, &c.*] So Mark xv. 43 (compare ch. ii. 25). In place of this ex-

52 This *man* went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus.

53 And he took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid.

54 And that day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on.

55 And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid.

56 And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the sabbath day according to the commandment.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

*1 Christ's resurrection is declared by two angels to the women that come to the sepulchre. 9 These report it to others. 13 Christ himself appeareth to the two disciples that went to Emmaus: 36 afterwards he appeareth to the apostles, and reproveth their unbelief: 47 giveth them a charge: 49 promiseth the Holy Ghost: 51 and so ascendeth into heaven.*

NOW [a] upon the first *day* of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain *others* with them.

[a Matt. 28. 1.]

2 And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.

3 And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus.

4 And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in shining garments:

5 And as they were afraid, and bowed down *their* faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye [1] the living among the dead?

[1 Or, *him that liveth.*]

6 He is not here, but is risen:

---

pression Matthew (xxvii. 57) has: "who also himself was Jesus' disciple;" John (xix. 38) adds: "but secretly for fear of the Jews."

*waited.*] Or, "**was waiting for.**"

**53.** *wherein never, &c.*] Compare John xix. 41.

**54.** *drew on.*] Quite literally, "was dawning," or "was beginning to shine." The original word, which is properly used of the opening of the natural day, is here transferred to that of the conventional day, which began (with the Jews) in the evening. So De Wette, Meyer, Godet, Oosterzee, and most commentators. Kuinöl thinks there is an allusion to the lighting up of candles on the eve of a Jewish festival. The first interpretation is doubtless the true one. Matthew (xxvii. 57) and Mark (xv. 42) say that "the even was come."

**55.** *And the women, &c.*] Probably we ought to read, "And women followed, those which had come with him from Galilee, and beheld," &c. Compare Matt. xxvii. 61; Mark xv. 47; and see above, verse 49; ch. viii. 2, 3.

**56.** *And they returned.*] *I. e.* from the sepulchre, as in ch. xxiv. 9.

*and rested, &c.*] The closing words of this chapter and the opening of chapter xxiv. ought rather to run thus: "**and for the sabbath-day indeed they rested according to the commandment; but on the first day of the week, very early, they came,**" &c.

CHAP. XXIV.—1-11. THE APPEARANCES TO HOLY WOMEN.

**1.** *Now upon.*] Or "**but upon:**" see on ch. xxiii. 56. In the account of the events which occurred on the morning of the Resurrection (verses 1-12) there is little in common between the Evangelists (see Matt. xxviii. 1-10; Mark xvi. 2-11; John xx. 1-18).

*very early in the morning.*] Or "**at early dawn:**" "when it was yet dark" (John xx. 1).

*and certain others with them.*] This clause which is wanting in א B, though found in several uncial MSS, was probably inserted to bring the text into harmony with Mark xvi. 1.

**2.** *the stone rolled away.*] St. Luke has not yet mentioned the stone. But see Matt. xxvii. 60; Mark xv. 46. Mark explains (xvi. 4) that the stone *was very great.*

**4.** *two men.*] From this it must be inferred that these holy women were not the same as those who are spoken of in Matt. xxviii. 2; and Mark xvi. 1; on both which passages see notes.

**5.** *Why seek ye, &c.*] With the rebuke to the disciples compare the words of the two angels after the Ascension, Acts i. 11. The ground of the rebuke lies in the designation

[b] Matt. 17. 23.

[b]remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee,

7 Saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.

8 And they remembered his words,

9 And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest.

10 It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary *the mother* of James, and other *women that were* with them, which told these things unto the apostles.

11 And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.

12 [c]Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.

[c] John 20. 6.

13 ¶ [d]And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from

[d] Mark 16. 12.

---

applied to our Lord "the living one" (absolutely)—He who hath *life in Himself* (John v. 26), and of whom it is elsewhere said, that God raised Him up; "having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it."

**6.** *remember how he spake.*] Ch. ix. 22 (compare ix. 44); xviii. 33. Matthew and Mark have also a mention of Galilee in this place; but it is an announcement to the women that they should see Jesus there (Matt. xxviii. 7; Mark xvi. 7). St. Luke omits all notices of the appearances of our Lord in Galilee, in accordance with his usual disregard to geographical details, and as a matter which would have no special interest for Gentile readers.

**7.** *sinful men.*] *The Gentiles*, ch. xviii. 32: compare Gal. ii. 15 (Meyer).

**10.** *Joanna.*] The mention of Joanna is important, as is shewn in the note on Mark xvi. 1. Ch. viii. 3. Perhaps we ought to read and translate, "It was Mary Magdalene . . . James; and the rest with them which told these things unto the Apostles."

**11.** *believed them not.*] See note on Mark xvi. p. 304, col. 2.

**12.** *Then arose Peter, &c.*] Or "**but Peter arose,**" &c. The conjunction marks the contrast between the conduct of Peter, and the unbelief of others mentioned in the preceding verse. The whole verse, however, is omitted by Tischendorf, and marked as doubtful by Lachmann and Tregelles; it is absent from D, and some MSS of the Italic version which generally agrees with D, but it is found in ℵ A B and all other MSS and Ancient Versions. It is accepted as genuine by most editors and ought to be retained. "This verse cannot well be interpolated from John xx., for the only reason for the insertion would be, to tally with verse 24, and in that case it certainly *would not mention Peter alone*" (Alford). Assuming it to be genuine, it agrees closely with the narrative in John xx. 3-10, of which it gives a very condensed report, omitting all mention of John, and thus showing its independent origin. The omission of St. John's name from the narrative is virtually supplied by Cleopas, verse 24. Thus we find here a remarkable series of coincidences.

*the linen clothes laid by themselves.*] Observe again the coincidence with St. John's account. "And seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself" (John xx. 6, 7).

*and departed, &c.*] Rather, "**and departed to his own home wondering at that which was come to pass.**" (So Bengel, De Wette, Meyer, Godet, and most interpreters): compare John xx. 10.

13–35. APPEARANCE AT EMMAUS.

**13.** *And, behold, &c.*] The narrative of the two disciples going to Emmaus (verses 13-32) is given fully by St. Luke, who thus completes the brief, but distinct account of St. Mark xvi. 12-13; where see note.

*of them.*] That is, of the general company of the disciples (compare verse 22), not of the Apostles themselves. Compare also verse 9, where "the eleven and all the rest" are spoken of together.

*went.*] Rather, "**were going,**"—were on their way.

*Emmaus.*] There appear to have been three places of the name in Palestine, one of which is mentioned by Josephus ('Bell. Jud.' vii. 6, 6) as distant about sixty furlongs from Jerusalem, and which may therefore be identified with the place mentioned in the text.

Jerusalem *about* threescore furlongs.

14 And they talked together of all these things which had happened.

15 And it came to pass, that, while they communed *together* and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them.

16 But their eyes were holden that they should not know him.

17 And he said unto them, What manner of communications *are* these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad?

18 And the one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answering said unto him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days?

19 And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people:

20 And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him.

21 But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done.

22 Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre;

23 And when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they

---

**14.** *talked.*] Or "**were talking.**" The verb is the same which is translated "communed" in verse 15.

**15.** *reasoned.*] Or "**enquired together.**"

**16.** *But their eyes, &c.*] "He appeared in another form" (Mark xvi. 12). The Evangelists agree in the result, that Jesus was not recognised. Mark speaks of a mysterious change in our Lord's outward appearance (compare John xx. 15; xxi. 4), St. Luke of a subjective impediment to recognition in the disciples themselves.

**17.** *ye have.*] The word so translated properly means "Ye cast backwards and forwards:" it appears to imply some dispute or discussion between the two disciples, probably as to the rumours of the Resurrection which had reached their ears (verses 22-24).

*and are sad.*] There is a strong weight of MS authority in favour of the reading adopted by Tischendorf: "and they stood sad," our Lord's question closing with the foregoing words.

**18.** *Cleopas.*] A shortened form of Cleopatrus (compare "Antipas"), and apparently a different name from Cleophas, or more properly Clopas, John xix. 25. Of the person here mentioned we know nothing further, neither is it possible to determine who the other disciple was; but it is evident from verse 33, that neither of them was an Apostle.

*Art thou only, &c.*] Rather "**dost thou alone sojourn in Jerusalem and not know,**" &c.: *i.e.* "art thou the only sojourner in Jerusalem who does not know?" &c. Cleopas thought that the supposed stranger was one of the numerous persons who had come up to sojourn at Jerusalem during the period of the paschal feast, and expressed surprise at his being there without having heard of the death of Jesus of Nazareth; he assumes that no other person could have been at Jerusalem at the time without hearing of it.

**19.** *mighty in deed, &c.*] Compare Acts vii. 22.

**20.** *to be condemned to death.*] Literally, "unto condemnation of death." St. Luke here omits to mention the Roman soldiers, from which Renan strangely infers that he studiously favours the Romans; but the speaker here naturally assumes the agency of the Romans as a fact too well known to need stating, especially since it had no bearing on the present question. Thus, too, in ch. xxiii. 47 we only learn from an incidental notice that a centurion was present at the Crucifixion. See Renan, 'Les Évangiles,' p. 254, n. 2.

**21.** *trusted.*] ℵ with certain MSS of less authority has "trust;" but the text is doubtless correct.

*redeemed Israel.*] Compare Acts i. 6.

**22.** *of our company.*] Literally "of us."

*which were.*] Or "having been" (verse 1-9). The form of expression in this verse (*saying, which said*) shews how little weight the speaker attached to the evidence which he had received.

had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive.

24 And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found *it* even so as the women had said: but him they saw not.

25 Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken:

26 Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?

27 And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.

28 And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went: and he made as though he would have gone further.

29 But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them.

30 And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread,

---

**24.** *certain.*] Plural: therefore not Peter alone (verse 12, where see note: compare John xx. 3).

**25.** *Then he said.*] Literally, *and he* (emphatically) or "he himself," &c.

*fools, and slow of heart.*] The former epithet refers to intellectual, the latter to moral impediments to belief. The disciples are reproved for not believing the evidence of the women, when they would have been led to the same conclusion by the voice of prophecy if they had attended to it.

**26.** *Ought not Christ?*] Or "**ought not the Christ:**" was it not predicted of Him? Was it not necessary as a fulfilment of the Divine will declared by the Prophets? Compare verse 46.

**27.** *beginning at.*] *I.e.* taking His arguments from. He went to each of the sacred writers for evidence, and so "began with" each separately. So Meyer, Godet, and others against De Wette, who explains "He began with Moses and went on to the other prophets," comparing Acts iii. 24. "They who consult the teaching of Jesus and His Apostles with respect to the prophecies concerning the Messiah, need not grope in uncertainty, but should, nevertheless, remember that the Lord probably directed the attention of the disciples, on this occasion, less to isolated Scriptures, than to the whole tenor of the Old Testament in its typical and symbolical character" (Oosterzee). Compare verses 44, 45; Acts vii. 21-24; 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

*expounded.*] Or "kept expounding": the tense of the original verb implies a continuous discourse.

**28.** *went.*] Or "**were going:**" verse 13.

*made as though.*] Or "**was making as though.**" "Our Lord *could* act no otherwise, if He desired to maintain the character He had hitherto assumed; He *would* act no otherwise, because He desired not merely to enlighten their minds, but also to prove their hearts; He *would* really have gone further, had they not constrained Him by the force of love. He probably seemed about to bid them farewell with the usual blessing; but they already felt united to Him by so holy a tie, that the thought of a separation was quite insupportable. They therefore most earnestly besought Him (compare Luke xiv. 23; Acts xvi. 15), and pointed to the declining sun, with a conviction that their spiritual light would also set if they should lose His company. They reminded Him that it was impossible for Him to proceed in the night (compare Gen. xix. 2, 3; Jud. xix. 9), and requested that He would enter their abode—one of them being probably the owner of a dwelling at Emmaus, where a simple supper was prepared" (Oosterzee). In answer, however, to the last words of the passage just quoted, Alford observes that our Lord's taking on Himself "the office of the *master of the house* . . . alone would shew that it was not *their house*, but an inn." The same conclusion may be drawn from the original preposition twice made use of in verse 29, "abide with us, to tarry with them:" it does not mean "in their house," but "in their company." The entire passage is one of touching beauty, recognised by all critics. Renan's words are worth quoting, "L'épisode des disciples d'Emmaus est un des récits les plus fins, les plus nuancés qu'il y ait dans aucune langue."—'Les Évangiles,' p. 282.

**29.** *is far spent.*] Or, "hath declined;" perhaps we ought to read "hath already declined."

**30.** *sat at meat.*] Properly, "**reclined,**" according to the usual custom. See on ch. xxii. 14.

*he took bread, &c.*] Or, "**having taken the bread he gave thanks, and having broken it he gave unto them.**" The actions here ascribed to our Lord recall those re-

and blessed *it*, and brake, and gave to them.

31 And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he [1]vanished out of their sight.

[1] Or, *ceased to be seen of them.*

32 And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?

33 And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them,

34 Saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.

35 And they told what things *were done* in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread.

36 ¶ [c]And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace *be* unto you.

[c] Mark 16. 14.

---

lated at the institution of the Lord's Supper (ch. xxii. 19); but they equally remind us of the Miracle of the Loaves (ch. ix. 16), and if He was recognised by the two disciples *in breaking of bread* (verse 35), this was not because it reminded them of the Last Supper, at which the apostles only were present (see on verse 18), but because our Lord had probably often so acted in presiding at the common meals of His disciples.

**31.** *were opened.*] Opposed to *were holden*, verse 16. It is evident from this that the full recognition took place in consequence of the removal of the supernatural impediment which had hitherto prevented it.

*he vanished, &c.*] "The expression is a peculiarly strong one, implying a sudden and supernatural disappearance. His Body was now approaching its glorified condition, and obeyed more freely than before the will of His Spirit. Moreover, we must recollect that, properly speaking, Jesus was already no longer *with them* (verse 44), and that the marvel lay rather in His appearance than in His disappearance" (Godet). Compare John xx. 19, 26.

**32.** *Did not our heart burn?*] Or, "**Was not our heart burning?**" (compare Ps. xxxix. 3). They now remembered that they had felt the power of our Lord's words while He was yet unknown to them, and they reproached themselves for not having had the sense to draw the inference that it was Jesus Himself who spoke to them.

*with us.*] Rather, "**to us:**" they had listened to a continuous discourse (see on verse 27).

**33.** *And they rose, &c.*] It was about sunset (that is to say, about 6 P.M.) when our Lord vanished out of the sight of the two disciples at Emmaus. If that place was distant only sixty furlongs from Jerusalem, they may very easily have returned to the city in time to find the Apostles assembled together the same evening. We must suppose that the sudden revelation of Himself to them by our Lord induced them to abandon their plan of remaining all night at Emmaus, in order that they might lose no time in carrying the news of this appearance to the Apostles. With the narrative which follows (verses 33-43) compare John xx. 19-29, and the very brief notice in Mark xvi. 14. The two appearances of Jesus to the Apostles recorded by St. John, appear to be blended together in St. Luke's condensed account; as in other instances: see note on ch. iii. 19.

*them that were with them.*] Not mentioned by St. John, who speaks of the Apostles alone.

*The Lord is risen.*] In Mark xvi. 13, we read that the other disciples did not believe the report of the two to whom Jesus had appeared in the country. It is quite possible that some were still in doubt, while others confirmed the recital of the two disciples from Emmaus by an account of the appearance to Simon. Such a difference of opinion appears to be hinted at in verse 38, where see note: see also the note on Mark xvi. 13. At all events the appearance to Simon Peter, which must have been subsequent to the visit to the sepulchre, recorded verse 12, is noticed 1 Cor. xv. 5, where it is spoken of as having been followed by an appearance to the Twelve. These words are used throughout the Eastern Church as a salutation between Christians who meet on the morning of Easter-day.

**35.** *in breaking of bread.*] See on verses 30, 31.

36–48. APPEARANCE TO THE ASSEMBLED DISCIPLES.

**36.** *Jesus himself.*] Perhaps we ought to read "He himself." The form of expression here used appears to imply a sudden appearance (in John xx. 19, it is stated that "the doors were shut"), answering to the sudden disappearance in verse 31.

*and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.*] So

37 But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit.

38 And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts?

39 Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.

40 And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them *his* hands and *his* feet.

41 And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat?

42 And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb.

43 And he took *it*, and did eat before them.

44 And he said unto them, These

---

in John xx. 19; the words are omitted by Tischendorf with D; but the weight of MS evidence is in favour of their retention. "The ordinary Jewish salutation . . . but of more than ordinary meaning in the mouth of the Lord: see John xiv. 27" (Alford).

**37.** *a spirit.*] Compare Matt. xiv. 26. De Wette observes that the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection, recorded by SS. Luke and John, have somewhat of a ghostly character, and that he is represented as neither strictly in the body nor out of the body, neither, says this writer, can we conceive any intermediate condition. In a matter of which we are so profoundly ignorant our power of conceiving is really of no moment. "The Body of Jesus was now in a transitional state. We have no experience by which to form a clear idea of this transition, any more than of that to which it tends, the glorified body" (Godet). Neither does it appear reasonable to draw a distinction between the appearances recorded by SS. Luke and John, and those mentioned by the other Evangelists; it is true that they are described more in detail, as is usual in narratives peculiar to the third and fourth Gospels; but they are not otherwise more mysterious. And it is worthy of notice that the tone of our Saviour's utterances during the forty days is intermediate between that of His words during His earthly ministry, and that of the solemn and majestic communications from heaven recorded by St. Paul (Acts xxii. 7, 8; xxvi. 14-18; 2 Cor. xii. 9); and by St. John (Rev. i. 11-20).

**38.** *thoughts.*] Or, "disputings."

**39.** *Behold my hands, &c.*] Compare John xx. 27, where, however, our Lord shews His hands and His side. The incident belongs to the appearance on the octave of the Resurrection; St. Luke, as usual condensing the accounts, does not distinguish the two appearances. See also Mark xvi. 14.

**40.** *And when, &c.*] This verse is absent from the same authorities which omit the latter words of verse 36, and (like those words) it presents at first sight an appearance of having been interpolated from John xx. 27. Accordingly, it is regarded as spurious by Tischendorf. But the fact of our Lord's pointing to His hands and feet is already implied in verse 39, and therefore, such an interpolation would not be needed in order to bring the text into harmony with St. John's account. Besides, a corrector anxious to harmonise would have referred to the hands and the side, and not to the hands and feet only.

**41.** *Have ye here any meat?*] As a further assurance of the reality of His Resurrection, since they were still doubtful: compare John xxi. 5. There is, however, no mention of eating in the strictly parallel passage of St. John's Gospel: Mark (xvi. 14) tells us that "he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat," a point which St. Luke has not hitherto noticed, thus presenting an incidental coincidence. This proof of the Resurrection is appealed to by St. Peter, Acts x. 41.

**42.** *fish.*] Renan ('V. J.' p. 513) looks upon the mention of fish as an indication that the scene of this transaction was near the Sea of Galilee; but Caspari ('L. J.') has called attention to the fact that fish was brought in great quantities to Jerusalem at the principal festivals, and that Zebedee, in whose house the disciples were probably assembled, chiefly resided in that city.

*and of an honeycomb.*] These words are absent from the most important uncial MSS; but it is difficult to account for their having found their way into the text unless we suppose them to be genuine. They are unquestionably of high antiquity, being quoted by Athanasius and the two Cyrils, and extant in many uncial and nearly all cursive MSS.

**44.** *And he said, &c.*] Taking the remainder of the chapter as it stands, and without reference to any other account, we should suppose that the Evangelist intended us to

*are* the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses; and *in* the prophets, and *in* the psalms, concerning me.

45 Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures,

46 And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day:

47 And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

---

read the whole, from verse 36 to the end of the Gospel, as a continuous narrative of events which occurred at the same time, and that he regarded the speech of our Lord, verses 44-49, as uttered by Him when He appeared to the Eleven on the evening of the Resurrection, and supposed it to have been immediately followed by the Ascension. This, however, would be inconsistent with the Galilæan appearances recorded in Matt. xxvii. 16-20, and John xxi.: and supposed in Mark xvi. 7; and, indeed, with the assertion of St. Luke himself that Jesus was "seen of them" (the Apostles) at intervals through "forty days." Some critics have ventured to suggest that Luke's original idea was that all the events recorded verses 36-53 occurred on the evening of the Resurrection, but that upon the publication of the Acts he corrected his narrative in accordance with other traditions which had reached him. Had this been so, we should rather have expected the Evangelist to alter his former narrative instead of confirming it, as he does Acts i. 1: considering his relation to St. Paul, it is impossible that he should have been ignorant of the appearances mentioned 1 Cor. xv. 5-7; and the style of this portion of the narrative has very much the air of a summary, as indeed is almost invariably the case when St. Luke adopts the accounts of the earlier Evangelists. "We must, therefore, rather suppose the Evangelist to be hurrying to a close in this portion of his history, and to be giving us a brief sketch of the words and actions of our Lord during the period between the Resurrection and the Ascension, which are summed up (Acts i. 2) in the expression 'Jesus . . . . had given commandments unto the Apostles'" (Godet). The sayings recited, verses 44-48, were uttered at indeterminate times during that period; that which appears in verse 49 having been spoken immediately before the Ascension; compare Acts i. 4.

*these are the words.*] *I.e.* "This is the meaning of the words:" compare ch. xxii. 37.

*while I was yet with you.*] "The expression . . . . is worthy of notice, for it proves that Jesus felt that His departure was already accomplished. He was no longer with them otherwise than exceptionally: His abode was elsewhere" (Godet). So in John xiii. 33; xiv. 4, and elsewhere in the same discourse our Lord speaks of His departure to the Father as if it were identical or simultaneous with His death.

*law of Moses, &c.*] Some have here seen a complete enumeration of the Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament, according to the division of them ordinarily received among the Jews, the Law of Moses being equivalent to the Pentateuch, the Prophets to the historical and prophetical books, and the Psalms standing for the Hagiographa, of which they formed an important section. It is not, however, certain that this division of the Old Testament was generally adopted in our Lord's time; and it is perhaps easier to imagine that our Lord is here referring to those portions of the Old Testament which are the most full of Messianic types and predictions; these would certainly be the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms.

45. *Then opened, &c.*] Compare verse 27.

46. *and thus it behoved.*] The words thus translated are probably spurious: they are absent from ℵ B D L, and though found in A are most likely an explanatory insertion. Omitting them we should render the passage "**Thus it is written that Christ should suffer,**" &c. Meyer, however, translates, "Because thus it is written that Christ," &c., this being stated as the reason for His opening unto them the Scriptures. The amended text will bear either meaning, but the former is almost certainly the true one.

47. *repentance and remission of sins.*] Compare Acts ii. 38.

*among all nations.*] Compare Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15, and especially Acts i. 8.

*beginning at Jerusalem.*] To be taken in close connexion with the concluding words of verse 49: compare also Acts i. 8. "Both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

48 And ye are witnesses of these things.

49 ¶ [a]And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.

[a] John 15. 26. Acts 1. 4.

50 ¶ And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them.

---

48. *ye are witnesses.*] So in Acts i. 8, "And ye shall be witnesses unto me," &c.

*of these things.*] Of my death and of my resurrection. Compare Acts i. 22; x. 41.

49. LAST APPEARANCE AT JERUSALEM.

49. *I send.*] This verse presents a striking instance of the habit of our Evangelist of passing from one scene to another without giving any indication of an omission. There can be no doubt that a considerable interval intervened between this appearance and that recorded in the preceding verses. Our Saviour says distinctly, "I send" (or rather, "I am sending") "the promise of my Father," and the personal pronoun in the original is emphatic: He pledges, as it were, His own word for the fulfilment of the promise. But He also claims to Himself the power of sending the Holy Spirit (compare John xv. 26; Acts ii. 33), who is elsewhere said to be sent by the Father in the Son's name. (John xiv. 26.)

*the promise of my Father.*] So in the parallel passage, Acts i. 4, "the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me." The phrase made use of in the text, appears to imply some previous teaching on this subject, and in the Acts such teaching is directly stated to have taken place. Neither St. Luke, however, nor either of the other Synoptists records it: the allusion is plainly to the discourse recorded in John xiv.-xvi. "The promise of the Father" is explained of the Holy Ghost in Acts i. 5, 8.

*but tarry ye, &c.*] Or, literally, "but sit ye down." Compare Acts i. 4. "Commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father."

*in the city of Jerusalem.*] Or, as we are probably to read, "in the city."

*be endued.*] Literally, "put on" as a garment: compare Judges vi. 34, where the original has "clothed," rendered in our version "came upon."

50–53. THE ASCENSION.

50. *And he led, &c.*] The account of the Ascension is only found in Mark xvi. 19; and Acts i. 9-11, where see notes. The fact is, however, also referred to in John iii. 13; vi. 62; xx. 17; Acts ii. 3; iii. 21; Eph. iv. 9, 10; 1 Tim. iii. 16; and implied in the great prophecy of the Second Coming of Christ (Matt. xxiv. &c.), in the main argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. v.-x.) and in that of the Apocalypse. (See especially Rev. i.-v.) Both SS. Mark and Luke mention it in such a manner, that, without further information, we should have supposed it to occur immediately after the appearance to the Eleven of which we read in *vv.* 36–48. From Acts i. 3, we know that it took place on the fortieth day after the Resurrection, and *not many* (*i.e.* ten) *days* before the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost.

*Bethany.*] St. Mark does not tell us where the Ascension occurred. Luke tells us afterwards (Acts i. 12) that it took place on Mount "Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a sabbath day's journey." (See note on that place.) There is no contradiction between the earlier and the later statement of the Evangelists. Bethany lay on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, and the way from the village to Jerusalem lay across the mountain. A portion of the mountain may have appertained to Bethany, and may have been called by its name. And St. Luke speaks here with a certain degree of vagueness; he does not actually assert that the Apostles were led to Bethany, but "as far as" (meaning near) "to Bethany:" and his words are therefore satisfied by supposing the Ascension to have taken place somewhere in the neighbourhood of the village. Bethany and the Mount of Olives are similarly associated in Mark xi. 1, as well as in Mark xi. 11, compared with ch. xxi. 37. The traditional scene of the Ascension is one of the four summits of the Mount of Olives, overhanging, and in full view of, the city of Jerusalem, and now, covered by the village and mosque and church of the Jebel-et-Tur. The site, however, is too far from Bethany and too near to Jerusalem to satisfy the conditions of the narrative. "On the wild uplands which immediately overhang the village, He finally withdrew from the eyes of His disciples, in a seclusion which, perhaps, could nowhere else be found so near the stir of a mighty city; the long ridge of Olivet screening those hills, and those hills the village beneath them, from all sound or sight of the city behind; the view opening only on the wide waste of desert-rocks and ever-descending valleys, into the depths of the distant Jordan and its mysterious lake. At this point, the last interview took

b Mark 16. 19. Acts 1. 9.

51 [b]And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.

52 And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy:

53 And were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God. Amen.

---

place. 'He led them out as far as Bethany;' and they 'returned,' probably by the direct road over the summit of Mount Olivet. The appropriateness of the real scene presents a singular contrast to the inappropriateness of that fixed by a later fancy, 'seeking for a sign,' on the broad top of the mountain, out of sight of Bethany, and in full sight of Jerusalem, and thus in equal contradiction to the letter and the spirit of the Gospel narrative." (Stanley, 'Sinai and Palestine,' ch. iii.)

*lifted up his hands.*] In the attitude of prayer (1 Tim. ii. 8) and benediction. "This blessing belongs to all the faithful, for they were represented by the Eleven and those that were with them." (Bengel.) There is something peculiarly touching in this final separation of the Saviour from His disciples in the act of blessing them.

51. *he was parted.*] Or, "**He parted,**" for our version gives to the verb a distinctly passive force, which is not found in the original. The meaning of the expression will depend in some measure on the genuineness of the next clause, "and carried up into heaven." It is absent from ℵ * D and some MSS of minor authority, but it is found in MSS and versions of the highest character, and ought certainly to be retained. Assuming its genuineness, we have next to consider whether St. Luke is here describing two movements of our Lord, or one only; in other words whether the separation from the disciples here spoken of was previous to the Ascension, or was the Ascension itself. On the former supposition we must imagine our Lord going backwards, or turning round from time to time, and thus raising His hands to bless the disciples; otherwise the expression "was carried up," is (as Meyer says) a more exact explanation of the term "was parted."

*and carried up.*] Not by an angel or by a cloud, but absolutely and without reference to any particular agent. The tense should be translated literally, "was being carried up." "The imperfect is picturesque : Luke conceives a visible progress of the Ascension, such as he has more exactly represented in Acts i." (Meyer.) We must imagine our Saviour slowly rising above His disciples, with His hands still raised in the attitude of blessing, until a cloud conceals Him from the eyes of His followers. The same image is involved in the expression used, Acts i. 9, "while they beheld," and in our Lord's own words (John vi. 62) "what and if ye shall see" (properly 'gaze upon' as on a spectacle) the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?" (Godet.)

52. *And they worshipped, &c.*] Or, "**And when they had worshipped him, they returned,**" &c. The verb "worshipped" can only signify, in this context, the adoration which is offered to a Divine Person: Ps. ii. 12. (Godet.)

*returned to Jerusalem.*] Compare Acts i. 12. St. Luke mentions the appearance of two angels before the return of the disciples in Acts i. 10, 11.

*with great joy.*] "The joy of the disciples, in consequence of their Master's exaltation, which was a pledge of the victory of His cause, already fulfilled the saying of Jesus, 'If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father, for my Father is greater than I:' John xiv. 28" (Godet). "A prelude to Pentecost." (Bengel.)

53. *continually in the temple.*] In the closing words of the Gospel, St. Luke anticipates the beautiful description of the life of the Apostolic Church which he has given us in Acts ii. 46; iii. 1; v. 21, 42. And they also seem to shew that at the time when they were written, the Evangelist had already formed the design of filling up this sketch of the early disciples' condition in a later work. This supposition would account for the rapidity with which he hastens through the concluding portion of his Gospel, and the omission from it of many details which he gives us afterwards in Acts i. See on verse 44.

[*Continued.*

It was decided to reprint, without alteration, the Authorized Version from the edition of 1611, with the marginal references and renderings. Special care has been taken to furnish in all cases amended translations of passages proved to be incorrect in our Version. The Comment is chiefly explanatory, presenting, in a concise and readable form, the results of learned investigations, carried on in this and other countries during the last half century. When fuller discussions of difficult passages or important subjects are necessary, they are placed at the end of the Chapter or of the Volume.

The plan of the work was settled, and the writers appointed, under the sanction of a Committee consisting of:—

| | |
|---|---|
| ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, | BISHOP OF CHESTER, |
| ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, | LORD LYTTELTON, |
| BISHOP OF LONDON, | RIGHT HON. THE SPEAKER, |
| BISHOP OF LLANDAFF, | RIGHT HON. SPENCER WALPOLE, |
| BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER & BRISTOL, | DEAN OF LINCOLN. |

The conduct of the work—as general Editor—has been entrusted to the Rev. F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

The ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, in consultation with the REGIUS PROFESSORS OF DIVINITY OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE, advises with the general Editor, upon questions arising during the progress of the work.

---

*The following is the List of the Contributors:—*

## Vol. I. The Pentateuch:—

| | |
|---|---|
| **GENESIS** | EDWARD HAROLD BROWNE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Winchester. |
| **EXODUS, Chap. I.-XIX.** | The EDITOR. |
| **" " XX. to the end**<br>**LEVITICUS** | SAMUEL CLARK, M.A., late Rector of Eaton Bishop. |
| **NUMBERS** | T. E. ESPIN, B.D., Chancellor and Canon of Chester, and Rector of Wallasey.<br>J. F. THRUPP, M.A., late Vicar of Barrington. |
| **DEUTERONOMY** | Canon ESPIN, B.D. |

## Vol. II. The Historical Books:—

| | |
|---|---|
| JOSHUA ........................ | Canon ESPIN, B.D. |
| JUDGES, RUTH, SAMUEL . | Lord ARTHUR HERVEY, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. |
| FIRST BOOK OF KINGS . | GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Canon of Canterbury and Camden Professor of Ancient History at Oxford. |

## Vol. III.

| | |
|---|---|
| SECOND BOOK OF KINGS, CHRONICLES, EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER | Canon RAWLINSON, M.A. |

## Vol. IV. The Poetical Books:—

| | |
|---|---|
| JOB ........... .................. | The EDITOR. |
| PSALMS ................... .. | G. H. S. JOHNSON, M.A., Dean of Wells.<br>The EDITOR.<br>C. J. ELLIOTT, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, and Vicar of Winkfield. |
| PROVERBS ..................... | E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Vicar of Bickley, and Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, London. |
| ECCLESIASTES ............... | W. T. BULLOCK, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Secretary to the S.P.G. |
| SONG OF SOLOMON ......... | T. KINGSBURY, M.A., Prebendary of Salisbury, and Vicar of Burbage, Wilts. |

## Vol. V. Isaiah and Jeremiah.

| | |
|---|---|
| ISAIAH ................ ........ | W. KAY, D.D., Rector of Great Leighs, and late Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta. |
| JEREMIAH & LAMENTATIONS ..................... | R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. |

## Vol. VI. Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets.

| | |
|---|---|
| EZEKIEL ......................... | G. CURREY, D.D., Master of the Charter House. |
| DANIEL ......................... | H. J. ROSE, B.D., late Archdeacon of Bedford.<br>J. M. FULLER, M.A., Vicar of Bexley, Kent. |
| HOSEA and JONAH ......... | E. HUXTABLE, M.A., Prebendary of Wells, and Vicar of Weston Zoyland. |
| AMOS, NAHUM, and ZEPHANIAH ..................... | R. GANDELL, M.A., Professor of Arabic, Oxford, and Prebendary of Wells. |
| JOEL and OBADIAH ......... | F. MEYRICK, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln, and Rector of Blickling with Erpingham. |
| MICAH and HABAKKUK... | SAM. CLARK, M.A., and the EDITOR. |
| HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, and MALACHI ............... | W. DRAKE, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Hon. Canon of Worcester, and Rector of Sedgebrook. |

*In the Press,*

# THE NEW TESTAMENT,

WITH AN EXPLANATORY AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY, AND A REVISION OF THE TRANSLATION.

*By BISHOPS and CLERGY of the ANGLICAN CHURCH.*

Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A.,

Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

*4 Vols., Medium 8vo.*

---

## Vols. I. & II. Gospels and Acts:—

| | |
|---|---|
| GENERAL INTRODUCTION | WM. THOMSON, D.D., Lord Archbishop of York. |
| ST. MATTHEW & ST. MARK | H. LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, D.D., late Dean of St. Paul's, and the EDITOR. |
| ST. LUKE.......................... | W. BASIL JONES, D.D., Lord Bishop of St. David's. |
| ST. JOHN.......................... | B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D., Canon of Peterborough, and Regius Prof. of Divinity at Cambridge. |
| THE ACTS ...................... | W. JACOBSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Chester. |

## Vol. III. Epistles of St. Paul:—

| | |
|---|---|
| ROMANS.......................... | E. H. GIFFORD, D.D., Hon. Canon of Worcester, Rector of Much Hadham, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. |
| CORINTHIANS .................. | T. S. EVANS, Canon of Durham, and Professor of Greek in Durham University.<br>J. WAITE, M.A., Vicar of Norham, Northumberland. |
| GALATIANS .................... | J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester. |
| PHILIPPIANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, THESSALONIANS, and PHILEMON.................. | J. A. JEREMIE, D.D., late Dean of Lincoln.<br>Canon WESTCOTT, D.D.<br>WM. ALEXANDER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. |
| PASTORAL EPISTLES...... | JOHN JACKSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. |
| HEBREWS ...................... | W. KAY, D.D. |

## Vol. IV. Catholic Epistles and Revelation:—

| | |
|---|---|
| EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES... | ROBERT SCOTT, D.D., Dean of Rochester. |
| EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN... | WM. ALEXANDER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. |
| ST. PETER and ST. JUDE... | J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, and Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.<br>J. R. LUMBY, B.D., Incumbent of St. Edward's, Cambridge. |
| REVELATION OF ST. JOHN | WM. LEE, D.D., Archdeacon of Dublin. |

# OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

## CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

We do not scruple to avow our persuasion that, whilst the ordinary English reader will recur again and again to the volumes before us for the solution of those difficulties which his daily perusal of Holy Scripture, as well as the prevailing spirit of modern thought suggest, there are few, even amongst those who have devoted a long life to the pursuit of Biblical studies, who will rise from the examination of these volumes without feeling that they have gained some valuable additions to the results of their previous investigations.

In taking leave for the present of the Editor's personal contributions to this important work, we cannot but congratulate the originator and the promoters of the undertaking upon the selection of one possessing in so high a degree those qualifications, to which we have already alluded, of extensive reading, sound judgment, critical scholarship, and though last, not least, practical common sense, which are but rarely found in combination, but which are so pre-eminently desirable in the discharge of so important and responsible a task as that with which the Editor of the *Speaker's Commentary* has been entrusted.

## NONCONFORMIST.

We regard these volumes as a specimen of English scholarship, of which we need not be ashamed, even if it should be compared with the scholarship of any other country. The accuracy, the delicacy, and the scrupulous conscientiousness which have long characterised English learning are found here. The arrangement is admirable.

## LITERARY CHURCHMAN.

We feel that in many most important respects, this great work renders a public service and is a real boon to the Church. What the writers and editors have given us is most valuable, and we are sure that, in the usefulness of their work, they will meet with their reward.

## JOHN BULL.

We can thankfully express our entire satisfaction with the aim, style, and spirit of the writers. We are not here offended with any of the shallow dogmatism of the day. The tone is that of ripe scholarship, which can fully appreciate critical difficulties, without losing faith in the Divine Revelation. The Bishop of Ely manages to brush away in twenty pages all the cobwebs with which German criticism has sought to obscure the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

## GUARDIAN.

Apart from its specially excellent portions, there can be no question that the work will supersede all older commentaries for English readers, so far as an external commentary is concerned. For scholars and educated men, who want to know the literal meaning of the Bible thoroughly and profoundly, and who desire also to have their faith in the historical veracity of the Bible based upon a thorough and intelligent knowledge, this Commentary will be of great and special value.

## BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

We are satisfied that if the learned and candid scholars who have undertaken this work, complete it with corresponding ability, there will be a practically useful Commentary on Holy Scripture, as much in advance of all previous works of the kind as the dictionaries of the Bible by Kitto and Smith transcended all cyclopædias of Biblical literature accessible before their time. Strong common sense, a considerable scholarship, and devout feeling are conspicuous everywhere.

## EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE.

The same characteristics which marked the first volume are still evident—breadth, compactness, and directness. The notes, without being voluminous, are sufficient for the ordinary use—clear, and generally helpful, while they embrace the results of the latest scholarship. The book, as a whole, promises to be the best Commentary of its kind—explanatory without practical remarks or spiritual applications.

**ENGLISH INDEPENDENT.**

Our judgment of the work, as a whole, is extremely favourable. We do not suppose it will win back any who have renounced their allegiance, but it will, we hope, confirm the faith of the anxious, and perhaps wavering enquirers, and it will certainly give wise and careful readers a more intelligent view of Holy Scripture.

**WATCHMAN.**

Throughout we find learning without parade, and criticism without irreverence. The reader is kept well abreast of the times: contemporary as well as ancient expositors, critics, and travellers being laid under contribution. The original design of the work appears thus to be consistently carried out; and if any friends of Divine Revelation have been apt to fear the issue of the conflict which is now in progress, these pages are well adapted to reassure them. They may satisfy themselves that the truth does not yet want champions who need not, and will not "be ashamed when they speak with the enemy in the gate."

## *AMERICAN TESTIMONY to the SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY.*

### THE EPISCOPAL CLERGY.

*Rt. Rev.* HORATIO POTTER, *Bishop of New York.*

I beg to thank you for a copy of the first volume of the *Speaker's Commentary*, and to congratulate you on the privilege and honour you have of introducing that important work to the American public. There can be no manner of doubt of its great value, or of its eminent success. We have long felt the want of just such a comprehensive and complete Commentary on the Holy Scriptures for our Students of Divinity, our Clergy, and for a large class of general readers. The Editor, Canon Cook, has for many years been one of my most highly valued friends. He is an able man; and most of the distinguished contributors are well known to me personally or by reputation. I earnestly hope that a copy of it may find its way into the library of every Clergyman of our Church in the land. Of course, in saying this, I do not mean to deny that there are subordinate points about which there will be differences of opinion.

*Rt. Rev.* ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE, *Bishop of Western New York.*

The *Speaker's Commentary* is a feature of the age in which we live. It cannot fail to mark an era in the Scientific Exposition of Scripture for popular ends. It may possibly disappoint the very high expectations which have been raised by the names of those who are taking part in it, but it would fail to embody a larger amount of *fresh and condensed elucidation* of the inspired pages than has ever been brought together in a single work heretofore. For the Society who wish to form intelligent and critical opinions on points which are now everywhere discussed, in their relation to Modern Learning, the work is therefore a precious gift. It will enable them to read and to understand the Scriptures with relish and satisfaction. I doubt not it will deepen their confidence that "the Word of God shall stand for ever."

*Rt. Rev.* A. N. LITTEJOHN, *Bishop of Long Island.*

Though I have not been able, as yet, to examine the *Speaker's Commentary* as fully as I could wish, yet I have seen enough of it to justify me in saying that it will prove a most valuable addition to the department of Sacred Literature to which it belongs. There can be no doubt that it will obtain an extensive circulation, and will be highly prized by all who use it.

*Rt. Rev.* F. D. HUNTINGTON, *Bishop of Central New York.*

It may be said of the work that it not only meets a real want in religious literature, but that it meets a want which had become consciously and widely felt, not to speak of the needs of a large portion of the Working Clergy themselves, with little time and less money for books. Nearly all Parish Ministers have found it difficult to answer the frequent inquiry of the laity, "What Commentary shall we buy?" The best that could be done was to name half-a-dozen different exegetical books, on different parts of Holy Scripture, disconnected with each other, and some of them necessarily either very costly or very superficial. Till the *Speaker's Commentary* was proposed, there appeared small promise that the need would be supplied. That announcement awakened a strong and confident hope; and, in my judgment, the whole American public ought to acknowledge a great debt to your house for the re-publication.

*Rt. Rev.* THOMAS M. CLARK, *Bishop of Rhode Island.*

I have examined the *Bible Commentary* with sufficient care to satisfy me that it will probably be the most valuable work of the kind for general use which has ever been produced in the English tongue. I have the honour of a personal acquaintance with several of the bishops and clergy who are engaged in its preparation, and the reputation of all the contributors to this Commentary, for profound scholarship, is a sufficient guarantee that it will be conducted in the most thorough and satisfactory manner. So far as I have had the opportunity to study this Commentary, it appears to me that it deals with the difficulties of Scripture in an unprejudiced and honest way, while at the same time it is always sound and conservative. The common reader will derive a vast amount of information from its pages, and the most accomplished scholar can read it to advantage.

*Rt. Rev.* J. JOHNS, *Bishop of Virginia.*

I have not had time to give the *Bible Commentary* such examination as would enable me to express an opinion of its merits entitled to consideration by others; yet a partial inspection has impressed me so favourably that I cannot deny myself the privilege of possessing the entire work, and therefore request that as the other volumes are published they may be forwarded to me.

I am sure the clergy and laity will appreciate the service you are rendering in placing this valuable Commentary within their reach.

*Rt. Rev.* J. B. KERFOOT, *Bishop of Pittsburgh.*

After reading with much care and interest the essays which Bishop Harold Browne gives in his part of the *Speaker's Commentary on the Pentateuch*, I cannot hesitate to say that that well-known and very able and learned scholar has begun the work in a way worthy of his honoured name; and that from the tone and promise thus given we may anticipate great excellence and soundness in the entire work. Its general usefulness must be very great, for the intelligent, educated layman will find here scholarly, thoughtful, and clear answers to the popular scepticism of the day, as well as instructive expositions of the text of God's word. I hope that the whole Commentary may equal its beginning, and secure a wide circulation among American readers.

## PRESBYTERIAN CLERGYMEN.

*Rev. Prof.* W. G. T. SHEDD, *D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York.*

I have examined the first volume of the *Bible Commentary*, and find it a superior work. If completed in the manner in which it is begun, it will supply a want that has been widely felt. In the first place, it is concise and brief, so that the purchaser and reader will have an exposition of the entire Old and New Testaments in a small compass, compared with any existing commentary. Secondly, the difficult points and passages are not shunned, as is too often the case, especially in comprehensive commentaries. Thirdly, the questions that are raised by natural science are examined with fairness, and answered satisfactorily. Lastly, while it would be premature to pronounce a judgment respecting the manner in which the exposition of passages relating to disputed doctrinal points will be made, there can be no doubt that the Commentary, as a whole, will be firmly Evangelical, and that the whole influence of the work will be to strengthen the reader's confidence in Divine Revelation, and put him in a way to popularise it either in the Sabbath-school or the pulpit.

*Rev.* HOWARD CROSBY, *D.D., Pastor of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church.*

The *Speaker's Commentary* fully realises the expectations of its most hopeful friends. It is pithy and clear, and exhibits the condensed results of the best and latest scholarship. The English-speaking Church has long been demanding a popular and yet learned and precise commentary on the Old Testament, and for want of such, the reading and study of the Old Testament have been neglected. This Commentary, coming from a trustworthy and pious scholarship, will mark an important era in Bible research on the part of the Church at large. It will do much to put into possession of all, that which hitherto has been the exclusive property of a few erudite investigators. I devoutly thank God for this publication, and expect great things from it for the cause of truth.

*Rev.* M. W. Jacobus, *D.D., of the Alleghany Theological Seminary.*

The first volume of the *Bible Commentary* is a welcome earnest of another extensive and massive Bible work. Its most attractive feature is in the line of *excursus*, after the manner of a Bible dictionary, incorporating with the notes elaborate and valuable articles on important topics. This method commends itself especially in the treatment of the Pentateuch, and controverted subjects can thus be dealt with more fully than would be allowable in the notes. We were led to expect much from the editorship of Canon Cook, and we are not disappointed. *This work will fill a place not wholly occupied by any that has preceded it, and will add to the scholarly facilities placed within reach of Bible students in our day for thorough understanding of the word of God.*

We cordially recommend this work, more than seven years ago projected by dignitaries and scholars of the English Church, as well representing the present status of Biblical science.

*Rev.* Z. M. Humphrey, *D.D., Pastor of the Calvary Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.*

The *Speaker's Commentary* occupies a place of its own. It has peculiar merits. If I may judge by the first volume, no commentary of its size is so well calculated to give the reader a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures. It is specially rich in notes, which are treatises rather than simple explanations, and which embody the results of the latest and best scholarship of the times. It also fairly meets the difficulties supposed to arise from the progress of scientific thought and discovery.

*Prof.* Charles A. Aiken, *D.D., LL.D., of Princeton.*

The use which I have thus far made of the *Speaker's Commentary* has satisfied me of its adaptation to fill a place heretofore unoccupied in our exegetical literature. With sufficient unity of plan, and similarity in the execution of its several parts, it enlists larger and more varied resources than could be found in any one scholar. It is compact without meagreness, and usually minute enough for all ordinary purposes in canvassing difficulties and illustrating obscurities. It displays candour and sterling sense (so far as I have examined) in treating perplexities, and is well abreast of modern scholarship, philosophical, archæological, and historical, while maintaining the devoutness of a rational Christian faith. It is not wearisome in its parade of learning, and yet abundantly indicates to those whom duty or inclination may call to deeper investigation, the sources of a minuter knowledge. As a compendium, it will be prized by many who have access to more exhaustive commentaries, and will furnish helps fresh, solid, and sound, to many who have no access to, or leisure for using, the more extensive store-houses of Biblical learning.

*Rev. Dr.* Geo. L. Prentiss.

As far as I have been able to examine the *Bible Commentary*, it is evidently the work of thoughtful, devout, and earnest Christian scholars. Its tone and spirit are excellent; and if the whole Commentary is executed in this manner, the result will be a most desirable and important addition to our exegetical literature of the Holy Scriptures. My best wishes for the success of this new attempt to explain and do honour to the Word of Life.

## THE METHODIST CLERGY.

*Rt. Rev. Bishop* Scott, *Bishop of Methodist Episcopal Church.*

I regret much that I am so pressed with official and other engagements that it is not practicable for me to give the work such an examination as would enable me to write such a notice of it as would be satisfactory even to myself. I can say this, however, that having looked through the volume, glancing at paper, type, and binding, and reading an article here and there on important passages, I am very favourably impressed with the work every way. The mechanical execution is all that could be desired, and the notes are brief, comprehensive, and exhaustive, and, on the results reached, the mind generally rests with uncommon satisfaction. I heartily wish you great success in your noble but expensive enterprise.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON.